This is a digital copy of a book that was preserved for generations on library shelves before it was carefully scanned by Google as part of a project to make the world's books discoverable online.

It has survived long enough for the copyright to expire and the book to enter the public domain. A public domain book is one that was never subject to copyright or whose legal copyright term has expired. Whether a book is in the public domain may vary country to country. Public domain books are our gateways to the past, representing a wealth of history, culture and knowledge that's often difficult to discover.

Marks, notations and other marginalia present in the original volume will appear in this file - a reminder of this book's long journey from the publisher to a library and finally to you.

Usage guidelines

Google is proud to partner with libraries to digitize public domain materials and make them widely accessible. Public domain books belong to the public and we are merely their custodians. Nevertheless, this work is expensive, so in order to keep providing this resource, we have taken steps to prevent abuse by commercial parties, including placing technical restrictions on automated querying.

We also ask that you:

+ *Make non-commercial use of the files* We designed Google Book Search for use by individuals, and we request that you use these files for personal, non-commercial purposes.
+ *Refrain from automated querying* Do not send automated queries of any sort to Google's system: If you are conducting research on machine translation, optical character recognition or other areas where access to a large amount of text is helpful, please contact us. We encourage the use of public domain materials for these purposes and may be able to help.
+ *Maintain attribution* The Google "watermark" you see on each file is essential for informing people about this project and helping them find additional materials through Google Book Search. Please do not remove it.
+ *Keep it legal* Whatever your use, remember that you are responsible for ensuring that what you are doing is legal. Do not assume that just because we believe a book is in the public domain for users in the United States, that the work is also in the public domain for users in other countries. Whether a book is still in copyright varies from country to country, and we can't offer guidance on whether any specific use of any specific book is allowed. Please do not assume that a book's appearance in Google Book Search means it can be used in any manner anywhere in the world. Copyright infringement liability can be quite severe.

About Google Book Search

Google's mission is to organize the world's information and to make it universally accessible and useful. Google Book Search helps readers discover the world's books while helping authors and publishers reach new audiences. You can search through the full text of this book on the web at `http://books.google.com/`

AH 6JJZ K

Digitized by Google

HARVARD
DIVINITY
SCHOOL
Andover-Harvard
Theological Library

Digitized by Google

Digitized by Google

Digitized by Google

Digitized by Google

Digitized by Google

THE

UNIVERSALIST QUARTERLY

AND

GENERAL REVIEW.

VOLUME III.

BOSTON:
PUBLISHED BY A. TOMPKINS.
1846.

Digitized by Google

~~P.1145.25~~

WM. A. HALL & CO., PRINTERS,
141 Washington Street.

1210
79.3

Digitized by Google

CONTENTS.

ARTICLE	PAGE
I.—Divine and Human Agency	5
II.—The Scriptural Doctrine concerning the Soul, and its continued Existence after Death	27
III.—Martineau's "Endeavors after the Christian Life"	58
IV.—An Evening Landscape	78
V.—The Divine Purpose in the Reconciliation of All	79
VI.—Non-Resistance	89
VII.—Literary Notices	106
VIII.—The White Mountains	113
IX.—The Death-Penalty	143
X.—Uses of Evil	167
XI.—The Christ of the Gospels necessary to explain the Phenomena of Christianity	186
XII.—Religion and the Fine Arts	200
XIII.—Medicine for the Heart	216
XIV.—Literary Notices	217
XV.—War.—Personal Injury	221
XVI.—Divine Love	246
XVII.—The Attractions of the Cross	255
XVIII.—Justin Martyr; or, the Orthodox Faith, A. D. 150–165	272
XIX.—The Seal of Christ's Messiahship	301
XX.—Illustrations of New Testament Words	316
XXI.—1. "If a Man die, shall he live again?"	321
2. The Saviour's Prayer	322

Digitized by Google

ARTICLE PAGE
XXII.—Literary Notices..... 323
XXIII.—The Ronge Reform..... 329
XXIV.—Universalism the Demand of the Age..... 341
XXV.—Philosophy Imperfect—Christianity Perfect..... 352
XXVI.—The Faith requisite to Christian Fellowship..... 366
XXVII.—1. God's Temple..... 393
2. The Joy of Sadness..... 394
XXVIII.—Death and its Agencies..... 395
XXIX.—Lessons of Theology taught in the Works of Creation 413
XXX.—The Sources of National Prosperity and Ruin..... 421
XXXI.—Literary Notices..... 432

Digitized by Google

Period
2075
v. 3
1846

UNIVERSALIST QUARTERLY

AND

GENERAL REVIEW.

Article I.

Divine and Human Agency.

We are not unmindful of the personages, and of the place, to which the great poet ascribes the first recorded discussion of this topic, nor of the dubious results to which the immortal fathers of metaphysics came, while they

> reasoned high
> Of Providence, Foreknowledge, Will and Fate,—
> Fixed Fate, Free-will, Foreknowledge absolute;
> And found no end, in wandering mazes lost.

If it be true, however, that the question had its rise under such dire auspices, we may reflect that, subsequently, the foul reproach of its origin has been happily removed, by the labors of human philosophers and of grave divines, who have transferred the discussion to our world, and naturalized it even in the church. Still, it must be confessed, they have not cleared away the perplexities in which the original disputants are said to have lost themselves. In this one respect, at least, the ill-omen of that first attempt seems to exert its malign influence down to our own day. After some centuries, now, during which the question of Necessity or Free-will has been argued, on both sides, by the most profound and acute thinkers, what

Digitized by Google

is the result, even with the higher order of minds, as well as with the lower? Two opposite conclusions; each of them held by men of deep and patient thought, who have read, and analyzed, and, as they think, fairly solved, or superseded, all that has been brought forward on the other side! The controversy is now as far from an "end" as ever, and apparently farther than formerly.

We confess, in the outset, that we have no expectation of putting the matter at rest. Indeed, we have no expectation of laying it open to the bottom. If we mistake not, the subject is one that has two sides, both of them running out parallel to each other, as far as the human understanding can trace it. Of course, people, whose minds are differently trained, will see it in different aspects; even the same person will see it differently at different times, accordingly as he fixes his attention more on one side or the other. The most we can hope for, is, to contribute something towards guarding against an exclusively partial view on either hand, and to bring people to look at both sides in their mutual relations. But as to the ultimate point, which terminates and solves the question, it is not to be reached by such powers as we have; much less is it to be explained to any general satisfaction. A glance at the history of argument and opinion on the subject, for the last two centuries, is enough to show how arrogant would be the hope of success in this respect.

We say, for the last two centuries; for, until that period, the metaphysical question between Necessity and Free-will appears to have been but little agitated in the church,—the ancient controversy between Augustinism and Pelagianism having turned on another point, as did likewise the controversy between Calvinism and Arminianism, in its early stages. It is true, that Calvin himself, and the *Supra-lapsarian* party, asserted, though in general rather than in philosophical terms, the absolute government of the Divine will over the human, in all its exercises, both before and after the Fall. But the followers of Augustine, and most of the advocates of Predestination down to the middle of the seventeenth century, held that the human will was at first free, and that it continued so till the Fall of Adam, and indeed that it remains so, still, in relation to every thing except moral objects. Generally speaking,

Digitized by Google

they had no thought of its original and universal subjection, in the immutable nature of things; they contended only for its accidental subjection, and this merely to sin, in consequence of the entire moral perversity into which, it was alleged, man had fallen. The great question between them and their opponents was not a philosophical, but a theological, one; namely, Whether the Fall corrupted our nature so completely as to destroy that original freedom, or competency, to choose moral good, as we choose other things, — whether it made us wholly inclined to evil, so as to leave within us no element whatsoever of moral good, and therefore no means of forming a good intention. This was the point at issue; here was the polemical arena. Not but that both parties frequently strayed out around into the wide, dusky, unexplored regions of metaphysics, in order to gather illustrations, and to escape from difficulties. There, however, the light and darkness were to them undivided, and it was commonly the case that they soon returned from their "wandering mazes," to the old familiar ground of dispute.

But when philosophical inquiries concerning the will began to enter largely into this theological debate, the ground of contest became essentially changed; though the circumstance was not generally observed. The question no longer was, whether man had lost his original freedom, but whether he ever had any; or, more strictly speaking, whether he ever had a free, purely self-caused volition, in respect to any thing. Now, it is easy to see, in this change of the question, that the controversy, though still carried on under the same name as formerly, was, in reality, about a very different matter. The term, freedom, was unconsciously shifted, from the old theological idea, back to another that lay wholly behind it. In the old dispute, it was merely relative, and meant freedom to choose good *in the same sense only that we are free to choose any thing else*, whatsoever that sense might be; in the new, it went back of all this, and meant an independent self-determining power of the will in all matters indifferently. No two things could be more distinct; and yet, deceived by the ambiguous term, people have generally confounded them together, and treated them as if they were the same, — as if disproof of the latter was disproof of the former. It

Digitized by Google

is probably the common impression, even at this day, that if the philosophical question concerning the will be decided in favor of its absolute dependence, *that* settles the point in controversy between Calvinism and Arminianism with respect to the special impotence of fallen man, in the work of regeneration. True, it may do something, indirectly, towards settling the matter; but to a very different result than is usually supposed. Say, that there is no independent, self-determining power of the will, in any case; it may still be true that man has the *same kind* of freedom (or whatsoever we call it,) to choose good, that he has to choose other objects. According to the doctrine of Necessity, it was equally the case before the Fall as afterwards, that man could will neither good, nor evil, nor any thing else, except as he was made to do so by some efficient causes, some adequate motives, that lay back of his will and determined it. Now, grant that man fell; grant that he became totally corrupt,—though we, of course, believe nothing of the kind. Yet, how could even such a change materially affect the laws of his will? we mean, with respect to this one power of choosing good or evil. Was not his will just as perfectly under the control of causes, as it had been before? of causes, which were still employed, in the counsel of God, as means to determine his volitions? and which did actually determine them as efficiently as ever? According to the doctrine of Necessity, he was no more dependent, or impotent, in the act of choosing good, than he originally was; no more than he still was, in choosing any thing else. He might still be made to attach himself to good, by the same general law as formerly, that is, by the controlling influence of adequate motives. On this ground, there was nothing peculiar, so far as moral impotence is concerned, in his condition after the Fall. Such is the way in which the doctrine of Necessity goes to determine this point in the dispute between Calvinism and Arminianism.

We may be told, however, that, even on this ground, there still is a peculiarity in the case, which we have kept out of sight, namely, that when man had become totally corrupt, destitute of every element of moral right, he could not, of course, turn his will to good. But, in what sense is this pleaded by the advocate of Necessity? Does he

Digitized by Google

mean that God could not still make man's will turn to good, by the power of adequate motives? No; but that man, of himself, could not do so. Very well; could he, before? Why, then, affect to limit his inability to the state of total depravity? And, even now, can he, of himself, turn his will to any object whatever? Why then say, to *moral good*, as if that were an exception to the general rule? If we mistake not, there is no room for any essential peculiarity here, according to the doctrine of Necessity. It may indeed be said that, in order for a motive to act efficiently to good, on man when totally depraved, the motive must be of a different kind than would otherwise be requisite; that is, it must be such as is adapted to the exigency. This is true; but not the whole truth. To express it fully, we must generalize the statement, by adding, that every different condition of man's mind, and every different act to be produced in him, require likewise corresponding differences in the governing motives that are presented. So that, after all, there is, in this respect, nothing peculiar to the case of total corruption, since it only comes under the universal law, of appropriate means to given ends.

It is an essential object, with the believers in total depravity, to make out some *peculiar* impotence of the will, in that condition. For this purpose, they availed themselves, at length, of the doctrine of Necessity, as demonstrating their side of the question on philosophical grounds. It was a sad mistake. That doctrine overthrows their own favorite position; it destroys the alleged peculiarity, by making it universal. To all *practical* intents, it establishes the utmost extreme of the Arminian hypothesis on this point, namely, that man still has the *same* freedom to choose good, *that he ever had, or that he now has to choose any thing else*, — no matter whether he be totally depraved or not. It will be found, sooner or later, that the Calvinistic party could not have selected a more fatal ally, in their cause, than the theory, on which they have so much relied, of the universal and absolute dependence of the will. Here we have one example, out of many, how the respective doctrines of Necessity and Free-will appear frequently to shift their bearings over to the opposite side, as they are carried out towards their legitimate results.

Digitized by Google

Enough, however, as to their particular bearing on this theological point. Let us now return to a general view of the case itself. We think it safe to say that, ever since the metaphysical question concerning the will began to be discussed in any thing like a thorough manner, it has been generally felt that the advocates of Necessity had the better of the argument in point of mere logic. And yet, people could not, for the most part, feel satisfied with their reasoning; they would not be convinced by it. There always has been, and there always will be, a repugnance, of a moral kind, against receiving its rigid process as complete, and its iron conclusion as final. The human soul instinctively repels every suggestion that may seem, in any way, to confound it with a machine. We must observe, however, that there is, on the other hand, a similar repugnance, though of the religious kind, against admitting any sharply defined conclusion of an absolute Free-will, such as excludes the superintendence of God. It is a curious fact, that in proportion as either of these points is distinctly presented, and urged in its nakedness, is the revolt of our moral or religious nature, in spite of all that logic can do. The reason why this revolt has been more obviously excited by the doctrine of Necessity, than by the other, is perhaps in the greater acuteness with which this point has been defined, the more precise form it has worn, and the superior vigor with which it has been forced home on the understanding.

At first, the objections to it were urged, not so much on the ground of any perceivable defect in the process of its argument, as on the ground of the consequences it involved. It contradicted the testimony of our consciousness — so it was said, — and annihilated virtue and vice, merit and demerit, responsibility, and all moral distinctions. These absurdities, which were deduced from it, were held sufficient to set the doctrine itself aside, though it were proved ever so clearly, and to show that something must have been overlooked in the analysis, whether the oversight could be specifically detected or not. It must be acknowledged that this was rather a blank protest; nevertheless, the moral sense of Christendom sustained it, for want of a better. At length, a more complete and far more acute analysis of the question was carried out, par-

Digitized by Google

ticularly by Edwards and Priestley, who fairly met all the common objections, unless we except that which was founded on moral responsibility. Their reasoning seemed to go to the bottom of the case; it was so thorough, so straightforward, and so closely, so firmly linked, that it had the form and texture of absolute demonstration. For a while the doctrine of Free-will seemed utterly exploded from the fields of philosophical argument; but, with how much practical success? The number of believers, on the victorious side, has not been very sensibly increased. The minds of men retained the same scruples as ever; people felt the same difficulties in the way of conviction, as before they were solved. They could not refute the argument; but they could not believe. Other metaphysicians, however, soon came forward to point out material errors, as they were deemed, in the boasted analysis of the Necessitarians. The present century, especially, has been characterized by attempts of nearly all the leading philosophers to carry the investigation down under the whole course of demonstration which Edwards and Priestley pursued, and to convict their party of having mistaken the real facts in our consciousness, and of having disregarded the peculiar laws of mind as distinguished from those of matter. It is not for us, here, to assume the right of pronouncing summarily, whether all this has been truly made out. There can be no question, however, that the tide of opinion, among philosophers, as well as among others, is now setting more strongly than heretofore towards the doctrine of Free-will, in face of all that has been demonstrated against it. The movement is very sensibly felt even in the religious world. Many of the divines, whose prejudices, both philosophical and theological, ran in favor of the Necessitarian doctrine, have already been carried over to the opposite side, notwithstanding the struggles of their brethren to retain them. The question will doubtless have to be argued anew, since the old arguments, whether sound or unsound, do not suffice for the demands of the human soul. The parties have, as yet,

found no end, in wandering mazes lost.

What if we should give up the expectation of finding the end, and be content to ascertain what may be known on

Digitized by Google

both sides of the subject, without aiming, for the present, to reconcile the facts with each other, or to complete the circle of ideas into which we run.

There are two ways in which, as Christians, we may consider the subject. We may inquire into the purely scriptural view, which we shall also call the moral and religious view; or, we many enter on the philosophical analysis of the question. It appears to us, however, that these two methods, which have sometimes been coupled and pursued together, ought to be kept distinct and apart, for the following reasons: The Scriptures very seldom, if ever, treat subjects in the philosophical method. On most topics, their language is not to be interpreted as the precise language of science, but rather as that of common life. Is it not so in the case now before us? Neither do they commonly enter into abstractions, nor follow their own doctrines out into the metaphysical subtilties in which all speculation at length loses itself. They pass over nice points, as a plain, unsophisticated man passes over them in his ordinary mood of thinking; they deal with great truths under such broad aspects only as may be recognized by the most common minds, and applied to practice. In these circumstances, if we attempt to follow their premises to their philosophical results, we are pretty sure to wander out of the circle of thoughts that belong to the purely scriptural view. We go either beyond, or aside from, the simple intent of the writer, and implicate him in meanings he did not distinctly embrace. They may appear to us legitimate and necessary inferences from his positions; but this is the same as to say that they are not his naked positions themselves, nor what he thought of,—they are only our inferences. We must be careful, therefore, to look through his medium, instead of our own, and to limit ourselves to the circle of ideas he had in his mind.

What view, then, do the Scriptures take of our subject? Obviously, a two-sided view. While it is their habitual practice to speak of man as willing of himself, choosing of himself, changing his mind of himself, &c., in the same way as they speak of his doing any thing else of himself, they also, on all proper occasions, recognize the divine agency, or counsel, as supreme over the human mind and

Digitized by Google

actions. Men are always regarded, as we regard them in the practical relations of life, as free-agents, we mean in the common undefined acceptation of this term; and yet God is represented as making them voluntarily disposed to such ends, as he pleases, without infringing the laws of their volition. He sometimes awakens discord in the counsels of men, disheartens them in their purposes, turns them from their course, and makes both individuals and communities subservient to his will. He beckons to the nations from afar, and they, unconscious of his agency, come in battle-array to execute his judgments on his people. It is he who sends Joseph into Egypt, but through the voluntary doing of wicked brethren. Not, however, that he made them wicked; in the view of the sacred historian, since they were already so; but he turns their wickedness to his own ends, and eventually to their good. He superintends and directs those complicated processes, in which thousands of men are the immediate and component actors; as, in the deliverance of the Israelites under Moses, he hardens the heart of the already perverse Pharoah, gives the Hebrews favor in the eyes of the Egyptians, &c., &c. In the times of the New Testament, he blinds the already rebellious Jews, but chooses a remnant of them according to an election of grace, and effectually calls the Gentiles to believe. His counsel is recognized as underlying, in some sense, the whole mass of transactions, good and bad, by which the "kingdom of heaven" was established in the hearts of men. Even in the crucifixion of Christ, he but accomplishes his own "determination," by means of "Herod and Pontius Pilate with the people of Israel." At the same time, all this does not impair men's responsibility to God for their disposition and conduct; in the very cases referred to, they are condemned and punished, or approved and rewarded, according to their own deeds, without respect to the purposes they have unconsciously subserved in the higher economy of God. On the other hand, men rebel against their Maker, refuse to hearken to his voice, disobey his commands, resist his spirit, and walk contrary to his will; and, in all these cases, the act is regarded as their own. They also follow his precepts, receive the truth, put off the old man and put on the new man, or change their characters; and here,

Digitized by Google

likewise, the act is regarded as their own. Again: it is man who is everywhere called upon to repent, and blamed for not repenting; and it is God who gives him repentance. It is man who is required to believe, and condemned for not believing; and it is God who gives him faith. It is man who must "work out his own salvation with fear and trembling; and it is God who works within him both to will and to do, of his good pleasure." It is man who is required to cease from evil and to do good, to purify his mind, to conform himself to the divine law, to love God and his neighbor; and it is God who is entreated to give us these dispositions, and who is thanked for the bestowment of them, when they have been attained. But we need not go on with the exemplification of this double view. If the two elements in the case appear more sharply contrasted, here, more antithetically expressed, than they commonly are in the Bible, it is only because we have been obliged to set them in closer juxtaposition, in order to bring our abstract into convenient space. We presume that no one, familiar with the Scriptures, will think we have at all heightened the coloring which they give to either side.

Now, make as much abatement as we please for supposed figures of speech, oriental hyperboles, for every thing that respects the mere style of expression, and still two things are clear: The inspired writers did habitually regard man as having an agency, a responsible volition, of his own, in all his conduct, in the same sense that he had a personality of his own; and, again, they did habitually contemplate the divine counsel as lying back of that agency, and affecting it, in some way, to sure results without disturbing its laws, or relieving it of its accountability. Even in the case of sin, if they do not distinctly bring the beginning of it, in a person's mind, under the divine direction, they do the subsequent operation of it, and its eventual results. And here they stop. They do not enter into the *philosophy* of the matter, at all; they never attempt to define the precise distinction between the divine and human, or to fix the point where these coalesce. Probably, they never thought of that question; it certainly was a long time before their successors, in the Christian church, appear to have thought of it, in any of its nicer metaphysical forms.

Digitized by Google

Such, then, is the two-fold state of the matter, as it stands out, unsolved, on the face of the inspired page. We must now add, that it stands the same, and equally unsolved, in our moral and religious nature. No man can suppress the consciousness that he himself performs his own acts, whether of body or of mind; that he thinks his own thoughts, wills his own intents, makes his own resolves, as much as he makes his bargains or his fences; that he checks or indulges his own inclinations, and thus far forms his own character; and that he is responsible in all these respects. And if he is a religious man, he must, at the same time, recognize the divine power as supreme over his own, in relation even to these personal exercises. He does not, indeed, regard his sin as the work of God, unless he has come to such a conclusion by some process of reasoning; but he does, at once and instinctively, regard it as subject to the divine control. By the spontaneous impulse of the religious sentiment, he looks to God for "every good and perfect gift," of a spiritual as well as of a physical nature. He prays to God for a true heart, for wisdom, for moderation, for courage, for a right choice, for repentance, for moral strength to withstand temptation and to overcome evil desires. He asks the like blessings for others, entreating God to convert sinners, to reform the vicious, to keep the tempted from yielding, to dispose the hearts of men to virtue, to direct the counsels of rulers. He sees the hand of God in all the movements of communities, of nations, and of the world. No matter whether, as a speculatist, he holds the doctrine of necessity, of free-will, or of neither; *these* are the spontaneous suggestions of his moral and religious nature; and he gives utterance to both trains of thought, without stopping to inquire how they may be reconciled with each other, or how they bear on the metaphysical conclusions he may have adopted.

Doubtless, the metaphysicians, on each side, are now ready to show us how the whole case legitimately resolves itself into their hypotheses respectively; into absolute, uncaused self-determination, at the turning-point, according to some; according to others, into the absolute determining of the will, in all its movements, by causes out of itself. Be it either way, then; but each party should remember

Digitized by Google

that the conclusion is their own, not that of the Scriptures. The Bible lays down no such definitions. Never does it pursue the subject out to these attenuated lengths, but leaves it where our moral and religious sense leaves it. Every thing beyond, is matter of mere speculation. Though, when once proposed to us, it will indeed excite our intellectual curiosity; still the decision of it, in either way, would be of no consequence to our hopes, our moral development, or our practice, did we, at the same time, but hold sacred the broader views which the Scriptures present. There is enough, here, to satisfy our religious faith, to afford admonition of our duty on one hand, and assurance of the results of the divine government, on the other. Not, however, that the attempt at a metaphysical analysis of the question is at all objectionable, if it be kept on its own ground; but it is important that the margin, between this and the field of Scripture doctrine, should be distinguished as clearly as possible, that we may know where we stand on the authority of revelation, and where we must take to our own speculations.

Before passing over this margin, we would, with all deference, offer a reflection or two, from what has been shown. It would appear, that any method of instruction, which goes to set aside either of the two grand elements we have pointed out, must be unscriptural in its purpose and general character, whatever partial selection of texts may be urged in its behalf. A course of teaching, which directly or tacitly paralyzes our own agency, and explains away our accountability in the conduct of life, is thus unscriptural; and must it not be injurious in its influence? To say the least, its hold on human nature must be brief; and but partial even while it lasts. For men will, in spite of themselves, reckon on such an agency and responsibility, in all common affairs, though they should deny them in theory; and to suppress the same ever-present ideas, in relation to our higher concerns, costs a perpetual effort, which exhausts us in the end. It is also apparent, on the other hand, that any course of professedly religious teaching, which excludes every thing but human agency in the conduct and destiny of life, or which recognizes no directing power of God over the mind, and even over the will, is equally unscriptural, as well as repugnant to the

Digitized by Google

religious sense. It will always be found, on trial, incapable of sustaining, permanently, an earnest spirit of piety and devotion. If these reflections be true, it becomes all ministers of the gospel to give both elements of the case free scope. We cannot conceive of a greater absurdity, than a *Christian* doctrine which leaves man and his destiny to his own independent determination; unless it be one which denies that he forms his own determinations, or is responsible for them.

There is also a reflection, that we would here present, with respect to the work of regeneration. It has been seen that the inspired writers habitually recognize the divine power as ordering man's ways. Even in common affairs, "the preparation of the heart and the answer of the tongue is from the Lord." Indeed, it is "in him we live, move, and have our being;" and "of him, and through him, and to him, are all things." Now, it is evident that, in ascribing our spiritual regeneration to the agency of God, the Scriptures only apply, to this particular work, the general principle they are accustomed to assert in respect to other operations of our minds, and which they sometimes assert in relation even to Christ himself: "I can, of mine own self, do nothing," said he. "The words that I speak unto you, I speak not, of myself; but the Father that dwelleth in me, he doeth the works." And yet, it was Christ who did these works, in every personal sense in which men do any thing. So, in our conversion, we ourselves are, in the same sense, the actors, though the divine power is to be acknowledged in this operation, as in the whole of our lives. We are as active in that change, as in any other; we work in it, and are moved to work in it, by the same laws that direct our volitions in the ordinary course of our experience. Appeals are made to us, and motives affect us, in the same way as in other enterprises; our own efforts are no less necessary, and are no more impotent, than in all the transactions of life. In these respects, neither the Scriptures nor our consciousness recognizes any essential peculiarity in the process.

We now approach the task of a philosophic analysis; but we do it with a feeling of our incompetence to give any thing worthy of that name. We shall, therefore, only

Digitized by Google

set down some thoughts on the subject, and perhaps offer some remarks on its treatment by others, without repeating, on either side, the arguments which are already familiar to every one who has surveyed the ground.

It should be observed, in the first place, that the two doctrines of Necessity and Free-will agree, when properly stated, to a much greater extent than is commonly supposed. We must confess, however, that when they are developed independently of each other, when each one is argued out straightforward, "through thick and thin," without regard to the corresponding facts on the opposite side, they do indeed run far apart, and end in very different results; Necessity in Pantheism, and Free-will in egoistic Atheism. But such a reckless course of argumentation, though it may seem very straight logic, is utterly unphilosophical, and indeed self-destructive. Both doctrines, in their philosophical form, may agree so far as this, namely, that man has an agency of his own, — free-agency in the common vague acceptation of this phrase; that he makes his own choice, and makes it just as he pleases, never against his will, but always by his will; that he forms his own character; and that he is guilty or approved according to his character; also, that whenever he wills, it is in view of motives, and under influences from within and without. The only point on which they must differ is, barely, whether man does all this under government of the law of causality, or, on the other hand, independently, — whether there are efficient causes behind his will, by which it always acts with certainty, or whether its movements follow from no such causes, but are strictly self-originated. This is the point at issue, — so sharp, so attenuated. The whole is, in a great measure, but an attempt to analyze the common vague notion of Free-agency, and to express it with scientific precision and completeness.

We must add, that in proportion as the two doctrines have been more and more carefully defined, they have always been found less and less to diverge. Is there a point, in the yet unexplored depths of the subject, where they come together?

It should also be observed, that in tracing them out, their bearings, even within the scope of our vision, often appear to shift sides, so that Free-will seems to turn into

Digitized by Google

the most frightful necessity, and Necessity into the highest rational freedom. Freedom, let it be considered, is never liberation from law. This is anarchy, the worst of all tyrannies; though it is often mistaken for the former. Perhaps this suggestion will be enough to illustrate the principle on which the two doctrines appear so frequently to counterchange their bearings. It may be well, however, to give some examples. Now, if the movements of the will are self-originated, in such a way as not to be produced by causes operating upon it, what is the use of commands, appeals, exhortations, inducements, or motives of whatsoever kind? These are always meant to act on a man, as causes, and through him on his will. They are used for the very purpose of moving his will to a certain determination. Have they legitimately *any* force on his volitions, or not? For, if he determines his will *independently*, or if, at the ultimate turning-point, his will decides itself by pure contingency, these motives are an absurdity, — they have nothing to do in the case. And, moreover, the man is not responsible in his act, since it is motives which give moral character to all acts. It would be a strange kind of freedom, in which motives did not govern the choice. No matter if it be said that the man chose his motives, in the case; for the inquiry would still follow, Was his choice of them, in turn, governed by motives — other motives that lay further back? and so on. Again: the very notion of such a freedom (pardon the misnomer!) as exemption from the law of cause and effect, in man's determinations, involves the idea of mind in a state of perfect chaos; we do not say, of madness, for madness falls far short of the confusion. A distinguished writer has well remarked, "Ought not, then, this freedom from causation to be termed rather a necessity of the most dire and formidable sort? and he, whose prerogative it should be, would become an object of as much pity, as the wretch who lives in the grasp and keeping of a madman. This power, or prerogative, of contingency (by the hypothesis,) obeys no motive, adheres to no connection of truth with truth, is not to be calculated upon, or foreknown, is not governed by relationship to any actual existence, or abstract principle. But it is manifest that, to an intelligent being whose welfare is committed to himself,

Digitized by Google

and who provides for that welfare *by calculating upon the known order of nature*, the liability to contingency, whether in the external or internal system, must be a pure curse, by deranging every provision and thwarting every purpose. A liability to sudden frenzy would not be at all more fearful than a liability to sudden contingency. The unhappy being, so privileged to live beyond the circle of nature, and so distinguished as an outlaw from the orderly system of causation, would be justified in making for himself such an apology as this: Whenever, and as long as, my conduct is governed by reasons and motives, I cheerfully consent to be treated as a responsible agent, and am willing to receive the due consequences of my actions. But not so, in those dark moments when the fit of contingency (my fatal glory!) comes upon me. Then, and in those portentous moments, I am no longer master of my course, but am hurried hither and thither, by a power in the last degree capricious, whose freakish movements neither men, nor angels, nor the Omniscient himself, can foresee. Fain would I surrender this fatal freedom, and take my place among those who enjoy the benefits of the laws of nature and reason; but it is the unalienable condition of my existence to be governed by a power more stern and inexorable than Fate herself. . . . . Now, could we deem it a perfection, in the constitution of a rational agent, that his power should operate like a vague and brutal violence, taking its course this way and that, with the blind vehemence of a hurricane? Or, is not rather the idea of rational perfection filled up by the supposition of power related on the one hand to its subject, by the bond of uniform and unfailing efficiency; and on the other to the knowledge and emotions of the agent, by the tie of infallible determination or direction? Whatever is deducted from the constancy or invariable sequency of these connections, makes a proportionate deduction from the excellence and *true* freedom of the agent. The agent whose power is not thus *necessitated*, in the most absolute sense, is, to the whole extent of the want of necessity, not free. A deficiency of necessity, in the *higher* sense of the word, is an increase of necessity in the *lower*. And here, once more, we must note the synonymous import of the words, liberty and necessity, when the highest perfection is spoken of."

Digitized by Google

It appears to us, in the second place, that reason, common sense, and even our consciousness itself, plainly recognize the grounds on which Necessity (so called,) is argued; and that the dissent, which there is in our nature, from the ultimate conclusion of that doctrine, relates to nothing in the several stages of its analytical process, but to something that may be supposed to lie deeper than the process goes. As to reason, we need not show that its deductions from general principles are in favor of Necessity, since this is commonly acknowledged; with the exception, perhaps, of what is inferred from the fact of human responsibility, and the reality of moral distinctions. We shall, therefore, proceed at once to the testimony of our consciousness, which is commonly supposed to be wholly on the other side. Now, the question, on this one point, may be reduced to a very simple form: Are we conscious that, in willing, or choosing, we will or choose independently of causes? we mean, independently of causes in the previous and existing state of our affections, habits of mind, &c., as well as independently of causes in the world of circumstances around, and in the considerations and inducements that come to us from without. We scarcely need say that, if we are conscious at all, in the case, it is of the very reverse. Observe, the question is not, Whether we are conscious of *doing* freely, what we already will to do; it is the will, not the consequent act, that we are now concerned with. Let the two be kept distinct; for, it is by confounding these, that most of the blunders are made, which are current on the subject. Neither is it the question, Whether we are conscious of willing without the sense of compulsion, violence; for, whatever it be that turns the will, it cannot, in the nature of things, be felt as violence, since the turning must be voluntary, — that is, must be the turning of the *will.* But, are we conscious that we will without any cause, good or bad, to make us do so? — this is the point. Sitting here, in my study, this quiet afternoon, the thought occurs, to rush out, bare-headed, into the street, and to cry *Fire!* at the top of my voice. Now, there are two things, here, of which I am distinctly conscious: 1. That I can do so, *if I please,* — all which, however, has nothing to do with the question. 2. That under existing circumstances, and with my habits of mind,

Digitized by Google

I cannot *will* to do so,—nor *please* to will so,—and for this reason only, that there is nothing to move me to the determination, and much to restrain me from it. I am conscious that my will is as the causes in the case. I can, indeed, conceive of some *other* conditions, in which such a will would be, not only possible, but certain; as, for instance, with my present habits of mind, let a fire actually break out, and the alarm be needed; or, let my habits of mind be thoroughly bent to the practice of all kinds of ludicrous, boyish mischief, and then let this wild freak be suggested to me, &c. &c. Or, change the case to one of a purely moral character: There is my good neighbor, over the way,—I am conscious that I can injure him, *if I will;* and I am equally conscious that I cannot, now, *will* to injure him, nor even try heartily to form such a will. I have the capacity to hate him, *were I so disposed;* but, just now, I neither am, nor can be, so disposed. I am conscious that I can neglect to visit yonder family in distress, *if I will;* and I am conscious that, as things are, I cannot *will* to do so, at present; though a new circumstance may occur, in the next half hour, or the next minute, which will determine me to that effect. And so, in all cases of the will, as distinct from the consequent act.

We have intimated that we are indeed conscious of *doing* freely what we already will to do. Yet, there is no dispute between the two parties, that, here, the consequent "doing," or act, follows by strict necessity, so called. It is produced by the will; it is governed, from beginning to end, by the will; and nevertheless our consciousness recognizes it as free,—we do not mean, as uncaused, but as free. This is a very significant fact, letting us, at once, into the real character of conscious freedom. I will to take up that inkstand; forthwith my hand, arm, &c., are moved by that volition, and directed by it, and all the process is regularly evolved out from it, by the law of cause and effect. Indeed, some metaphysicians hold that our first idea of causation, as distinguished from mere sequence, comes from our consciousness of thus producing effects by our will. Here, then, is an unquestioned case of what is called necessity; and still it is one of conscious freedom. In it, we see all the *fact* that is expressed, in common usage, or that is intended to be expressed, by this

Digitized by Google

latter phrase. The two ideas become identical; not, however, the two ideas involved in the metaphysical question under review; but the two ideas of acting by causation, and of acting freely. Indeed, we do not naturally conceive of freedom as exemption from law, but from oppression; we naturally conceive of it, not as opposed to what is here termed necessity, but as government by such law as is congenial with the nature of the case.

It is important to remark, by way of digression, that the term, freedom, is not the proper one to be set in contrast with necessity; or, rather, that neither term is fitly chosen. In the strict use of language, the will is actually free, in all its determinations, even according to the doctrine of Necessity; and so is the act which is produced by it. The question in debate, instead of being framed thus, Are our wills determined necessarily or freely? should have been stated in some such form as the following, Are they determined by the law of causation, or by contingency? are they governed, or not governed? &c., &c. We will not, however, dispute about words, but leave the old technical terms in their place, from which it would, now, be so hard to dislodge them. At the same time, the reader cannot guard too carefully against being misled by them, and by their associations. He must look through them, and fix his eye on the ideas for which they here stand.

But let us return. Had we proposed, in the outset, to show that the plain common sense of mankind habitually recognizes the principles of the Necessitarian doctrine, it would perhaps have been regarded as an extravagant paradox,—a sort of advertisement that we were about to enter on a game at ingenious quibbling. But at this stage of the development, it is needless to do more than just to refer to the facts which illustrate the position. Now, all social confidence stands on the universal persuasion that men's minds are regulated by certain laws, of which we have some general knowledge, and which, when known, may be depended on. All our calculations with respect to men's conduct, are made on the same ground. We all believe in the control of the human will by causes. We strive to turn each others' wills; and we actually do govern them, with quite as much success as a physician controls the course of a fever, or other disease. A man's practical

Digitized by Google

influence in society, is but the hold he has on the wills of his fellow-men. Whoever has charge of others for discipline, whether moral, intellectual or physical, is required by us to govern their wills to a corresponding extent; and if he fails, we cashier him for incompetency, or neglect. If a schoolmaster does not govern the wills of his pupils, within the prescribed limits, we censure him, turn him off, and get one who can govern them; for we know that such are to be found. How would he succeed, before practical committee-men, with a plea that his pupils were free-agents, and therefore not to be governed by man or God? The human will is, indeed, a very delicate subject, and the elements that go to make its particular determinations, in a given case, are so numerous and complicate as often to baffle our calculation; just as the causes that will combine to determine the blowing of the wind, at a given hour, are too various to be anticipated with certainty. But "if we knew a person thoroughly, and knew all the inducements which are acting upon him, we could foretell his conduct with as much certainty as we can predict any physical event."

Such appear to be the facts in relation to the movements of the will. All men recognize them, and act upon them. It is curious to observe, how perpetually disputants themselves betray their consciousness of them, even while arguing against necessity, or asserting absolutely independent volition.

At the same time, however, we ought also to remark, that all men evince an equally irrepressible consciousness that our wills are not determined *for us*, as the doctrine of Necessity in its grosser form, might seem to imply, but that it is we who immediately determine them; that it is we who must resolve, must settle the confusion of conflicting motives within ourselves; and that we must do it by putting forth efforts of our own, by exerting our own power of self-control, and thus ruling the chaos. In short, we are conscious that we are not machines, waiting passively to be put in motion; we are not impelled by any thing like mechanical forces. No man ever acts on this idea, even when he pleads for it; no man can act, but on the persuasion that we are living agencies, instinct with

Digitized by Google

power of our own, having the spring of action in ourselves, and that we are umpires amid surrounding influences,—all this, in every sense that we are personal beings, and not mere sections of a Pantheistic whole. The facts we have adduced, in favor of necessity, must be interpreted within limits circumscribed by these considerations; and these, again, must be held in consistency with them. A difficult problem, indeed! which we do not attempt to solve. We only bring together the facts on both sides.

There are two sides. Were we to take the doctrine of Necessity as adequately expressing all there is in the case, and stop at the conclusion that every volition of ours, every movement of our minds, every act, is but a fixed link in the chain of causes and effects, which runs forth from God, and constitutes the universe,—let this be regarded as the *whole* of the matter, and we are brought to Pantheism at once. In this case, God is the sole agent, moral, intellectual and physical. He does all the willing, he does all the thinking, through us; he makes our characters for us, does our labor in the field and workshop, loves for us and hates for us, eats our dinners for us, perpetrates our crimes for us. Or, rather, he being the sole agent, the only life of the whole, we do not exist as persons, but merely as integral parts of him; and it is he alone who acts in us as, literally, his members.

It is unnecessary to add, that, at this point, all moral distinctions would obviously cease, both in God and in man, if we might still use this latter term. There is another consideration, however, which is more likely to be overlooked: Even in its most guarded form, the doctrine of Necessity, if taken for the *complete* statement of the subject, legitimately resolves all moral principle into a mere notion or prejudice. For example: The universal chain of causes and effects, in its straight-onward process, evolves out certain actions in us, and evolves them altogether by the will of God, or by the unalterable constitution of the universe. These actions, in turn, have indeed their effects, of pain or of pleasure; but they are neither right nor wrong, we mean in respect to any absolute, eternal law. For this law simply is, that they *are to be;* never, that they *ought* to be different than they are, nor indeed that they *ought* to be even as they are. There is no

Digitized by Google

"ought" in the case. They are simply bald facts, produced by the regular development of the universal mechanism. There is no moral element in them, in relation to the great First Cause; though it is wisely provided that we should feel as if there were something of the kind. But this feeling itself does not reach beyond ourselves, and is found to be erroneous when judged by higher laws. We have, however, discussed this point more largely, in a former volume of our work.[1]

The doctrine of Necessity, then, appears not to cover the whole ground, at least in any form in which it has hitherto been defined. Though it be true, as far as it goes, there are principles and modes of power it does not embrace. Man is not only acted upon by causes within and without, but, in some mysterious way, he does, at the same time, really act from himself, even distinct from the action of God, in the same sense that his personality is distinct from the personality of God. In both cases, the sense must indeed be a limited one; but who shall tell us where the boundary lies! It may be said, that we are now following the subject into mystery. Well do we know this. There is mystery all around us, from the spire of grass that grows beneath our feet, up to the secrets of the invisible world; and are we so greatly astonished at finding it here? Before we explain the ultimate grounds of the human will, it might be instructive to try our skill at explaining the mysterious power of vegetable life in yonder flower. The power of the will is the life of the soul. Have we fathomed the depths of our own being, and laid them all bare, so as to name every element within us, as we name the wheels in a machine? Have we descended to the very bottom of our spiritual existence, found out the primordial germs of the soul, and traced every vital filament that connects it back with the existence of the Creator, so that we can tell, in clear scientific phrase, just how it operates? or have we seen through all the laws by which we live, move, and have our being, as separate personalities, but still in Him? When all this shall have been thoroughly done, we may expect to have a complete analysis of human agency in its relation to the

[1] Universalist Quarterly, vol. i. art. vi.

Digitized by Google

divine; and certainly we cannot have it till then. For, be it observed, our agency goes down the entire depth of our personality; the springs of our action are in the lowest foundations of our being. Who, but God, has looked in upon them!

To use the nomenclature of foreign metaphysicians, the subject is inextricably involved in the question concerning the passage from Psychology to Ontology; and that is a question we never can lay open, while we remain finite creatures. H. B.[2d.]

Art. II.

The Scriptural Doctrine concerning the Soul, and its continued Existence after Death.

Few questions connected with the study of human nature, have been more intensely interesting, or more universally inquired into, than that which relates to the soul, and to its continuance beyond this life. It is not enough to contemplate man as a mere physical being. Even in the rudest states of society, observation has proceeded immediately from the outward to the inner man. Soon as the human being has known its own existence, and surveyed its outward form, endued with life and motion, its attention has been directed to the spirit within, the rational life, and to a careful study of its nature, condition, and destiny. Consequently, in barbarous ages, and even among the refinements of ancient science and philosophy, psychology has always gone forward greatly in advance of physiology and anatomy. The early and profound attention bestowed upon this subject, seems to evince a consciousness, or universal conviction, that the thing itself is real, — that mind or soul is an essence, of some sort, distinct from matter.

In our age, and in Christian countries, the study of soul has assumed a different character. The evidences of its future existence and immortality, are based on divine revelation; and, on that foundation, people are content to rest, without inquiring how and whence the soul derived its existence, or what is to be the nature of its

Digitized by Google

disembodied being. Our philosophy seldom ventures to institute inquiries of this kind. Pneumatology, or the study of soul in its celestial abode, once deemed so brilliant a theme, has now grown old and lost its charms. We are content to know but little of the spirit beyond this life; but little of its nature, attributes, and occupations. We press our inquiries with all eagerness, as to its condition, whether of happiness or of misery, and then we pause. It is sometimes deemed presumptuous to go farther, and inquire into the mode of its being, its expanded capacities, its progress in knowledge, its connection with the present existence, and the influence which that connection may exert upon its future well-being. And even in psychology, we have departed from the ancient standards. The study of soul as an emanation from God, its connection with body, its transmigrations, and its final return, is laid aside to make room for the more sober and profitable investigations relative to its nature, properties, capabilities, and modes of action. And here philosophy has sometimes been carried to extremes. While man is studied as a material being, in respect to his physical organization, his vital energy, and the elements of his mental and moral nature, the question is often urged, whether there is any principle within him that does not die when the body is dissolved? There are philosophers among us who take the negative of this question, denying the existence of any spiritual essence in man. They maintain that the elements of his constitution are wholly material; that all thought and feeling, all intellectual processes and moral emotions, are the result of physical organization. Nor is this philosophy confined to such as deny all revelation, and even the existence of a Supreme Being. There have been distinguished men among Christians, learned, sober, and conscientious, who have doubted the existence of a principle in man distinct from body; who have reaffirmed, with Materialists, that when man dies, both mind and body are dissolved, and there is no continuous being. These have not doubted the resurrection and a future life. They have merely denied the natural or innate immortality of the human soul. And this opinion has extended, in some degree, to the common mass of mind, leading (can it be questioned?) in some

Digitized by Google

cases, to serious doubts and direct disbelief of the truths of revelation. Craniology, or that collection of shreds and patches from physiology, anatomy, and other sciences, which is called phrenology, may have lent its influence in strengthening these doubts and sustaining the grounds of Materialism. Its advocates may not have intended any such thing; many of them may not have seen the results. All such are very careful to absolve themselves from all solicitude respecting any thing save what "phrenology teaches." It becomes, then, a matter of serious concernment, to examine this question again; and to repeat the investigation until the truth shall be developed and embraced. The present generation must instruct the rising, and commit to the future its knowledge and its discoveries. In this way truth will be perpetuated, knowledge increased, and the common mind enlarged. And this very power or capacity of increasing and perpetuating knowledge, seems to indicate the perpetuity of mind. Does it not evince the existence of soul in man — soul different from body, different from brutes, and not the result of physical organization? It is certain that inert matter cannot think; nor is thought produced by vegetable organization. It is certain, also, that brutes cannot, by any process of reasoning, make new discoveries, or advance in knowledge and self-culture one step beyond the instincts manifested at their birth. But man is different; and that difference evinces the presence of some essence, substance, or quality, within him, of a higher order, which is called his soul.

Is that soul immortal? Does it continue to exist, or does it die and become annihilated, when life departs from the body? It is not designed to adduce the philosophical arguments in favor of the soul's immortality; but merely to inquire what light is thrown upon this subject in the sacred Scriptures.

In going back, then, among the records of the past, both sacred and profane, one of the first things to arrest attention, is the doctrine itself, that the soul dies not, but continues beyond this life. From the earliest ages of the Hebrew commonwealth, an impression prevailed among that people, more or less definite, that the dead, after their departure to the unseen world, retain a conscious existence.

Digitized by Google

Something of this may have been learned from Egyptian psychology; but it is probable that, even before the sojourn in Egypt, the family of Abraham, in common with the original inhabitants of Canaan, had some conviction of a continued existence after death. The researches and investigations of the learned, have served to show that such an impression has prevailed over the world, from the remotest antiquity, and in the rudest and most uncultivated states of society. Egypt, with her sacred and secular philosophers, is said to have the honor of first teaching the *immortality* of the soul. The mystic religion of her priesthood, which promised glory and immortality, was beautiful and attractive, as it broke upon the mind through the drapery of its solemn rites. But the question of the soul's *immortality* evidently belongs to a later age than that of its mere *continued existence*. While the former was unknown, and unrecognized in the sacred records, the latter was a common faith. Nowhere does history bring us the account of any nation or people of antiquity, who have not had some conceptions of a life beyond the present.

The question, then, becomes extremely interesting, both in itself and in its bearings on the point under discussion,—Whence was this impression derived? It has been maintained by some, that this, as well as other points of theological knowledge, was derived from early revelations made to the human race, and diffused by tradition through all nations. The different forms in which it has appeared in different ages and nations, are supposed to be corruptions of the original idea. But as there is no record of such revelations, and no evidence except conjecture, of their transmission among different nations, the theory may be dismissed without further remark. Others have assumed that the idea of a continued life, was a pure invention of impostors, who designed thereby to exert an influence over the public mind. Of this, however, there is no proof. And such a theory, destitute of evidence to sustain it, is wholly insufficient to account for the conception and general prevalence of the idea among nations remote from each other. Were there any priests or impostors among the aboriginal inhabitants of this continent, to invent and perpetuate the notions of future

Digitized by Google

life? On most of the different islands, which have been discovered in distant and remote oceans, the inhabitants have been found entertaining the same general notion of a continued existence beyond death. Has this sprung from imposture? It is not surprising that impostors should have caught an already prevailing impression, invested it with their own sombre drapery, and then made use of it for sinister purposes. Nor is it surprising that fear and guilt should have incorporated many errors with such an impression. From these emotions of the diseased mind, together with the prevailing idea of a future life, has, doubtless, arisen the error of endless rewards and punishments. But these are corruptions and abuses that spring from human depravity, and are utterly insufficient to account for the existence and general prevalence of the original idea itself. Whence, then, has it originated? May it not be inferred that God himself has dimly impressed it upon the human mind?—or that he has caused it to spring up naturally, in some faint glimmerings, from the peculiar mental and moral constitution which he has given to man?

Most philosophers are ready to admit that there are certain intuitive principles of belief called *first truths*, which spring up spontaneously in all minds. These are not susceptible of proof, because they stand behind, and form the beginnings of all our processes of reasoning. "They admit of no other evidence than an appeal to the consciousness of every man, that he does and must believe them."[1] "It is impossible to doubt them, because to disbelieve them would be to deny what our very constitution was formed to admit."[2] Among these fundamental truths, must be ranked "a conviction of our own existence as sentient and thinking beings; and of mind, as something distinct from the functions of the body. From the first exercise of perception, we acquire a knowledge of two things; namely, the thing perceived, and the sentient being who perceives it. In the same manner, from the exercise of any mental operation, such as memory, we acquire an impression of the thing remembered, of an essence or principle which remembers it, and of this

[1] Abercrombie. [2] Brown. Lecture on Mental Phil., vol. i. p. 127.

Digitized by Google

essence as something entirely distinct from any function of the body."[3] And this intuitive conviction is universal. No one can reflect upon his own body, without recognizing a principle within, distinct from it, which thinks, perceives, reasons, and examines into its organs and their various functions.

With such an impression, growing out of the very constitution of human nature, it was quite natural for people to suppose that mind might exist in a state separate from body. Doubtless, at a very early age of the world, they began to look upon the body as a mere tenement for the soul. And they would readily imagine that the tenant might leave its dwelling-place without dissolution, and, perhaps, without inconvenience. Is not this the origin of the psychological error of metempsychosis? The conception that soul exists, as an essence distinct from bodily organization, must, almost of necessity, lead to the associated idea of its continued existence, when the body is dissolved.

Nor can it be doubted that this conviction is the foundation of all our conceptions of a Supreme Being. We say very justly, that nature proves the existence of its Author. But what is the first step in the process of reasoning — the very corner-stone on which the whole structure is based? Is it not the consciousness which we have of mind, or soul, in ourselves? Before all reasoning, there must be some conception of a mental or spiritual being. Unless we fall into actual anthropomorphism, we must derive our primary idea of a Deity from the conception which we have of mind, or spirit, in ourselves. Having once formed the idea of mind, as an essence distinct from matter, it is easy to apply that idea to beings out of ourselves, and then to enlarge and perfect it, until we conceive of a God with infinite and absolute perfections.[4] And this was unquestionably the mode in which men first began to form a conception of superior beings. In the rude ages of the world, they saw all things in motion; and, unable otherwise to account for the cause of such motion, they ascribed it to mind existing in the objects. They were conscious of mind as the cause of their own movements,

[3] Abercrombie on Intellectual Powers, p. 157.

[4] Tholuck on the Origin of Heathenism, Bib. Repos., vol. ii. p. 86.

Digitized by Google

and naturally supposed that a similar principle resided in all moving objects as the cause of *their* motion.[5] Thus they drew from nature the evidence of a great Divine Mind. But, through ignorance, they were unable to confine themselves to *one* being as supreme. The original idea of mind or spirit in themselves, was perverted, and made the foundation not only of polytheism and idolatry, but of all the psychological vagaries that have prevailed in the world. Inanimate objects have been endowed with soul or intelligence, and then worshipped as divine. And the idea of human souls as existing distinct from body, and continuing beyond death, has been encumbered with innumerable errors, which have lessened its value, and sometimes rendered it suspected. It is not wonderful that truth corrupted should be lost sight of; it then becomes error. Nor is it wonderful that the fanciful theories, which have been advanced concerning the soul, should have led some to doubt its existence beyond death. The whims and speculations of false philosophy on the one hand, have naturally driven some minds into doubt and disbelief on the other. But between these extremes, there is a middle ground — an important truth which God has fitted men to receive. "By nature," says Cicero, "we are led to the belief that gods exist; but what they are, we learn by an exercise of reason; so by the consent of all nations, we believe that souls continue beyond this life; but what they are, and in what condition they will remain, must be learned by reason."[6] Is not this latter conviction the result of man's natural constitution, as well as the former? The consent of all nations is but an evidence that God has placed this conviction on the same ground as that of his own existence. It may not have the same strength and permanence, but it proceeds from the same general principles.

Such, then, is the origin of the notion, so extensively prevailing, of some sort of existence beyond the present. But without the light of revelation, it could not be expected to escape corruptions. Indeed, it was the very thing to open an avenue for human credulity, fear, guilt, and curiosity to bring in their fanciful theories. The idea

[5] See Bergier. Dic. de Theol., Art. Idolatry.
[6] Tusc. Q., lib. i. de Contemnenda Morte.

Digitized by Google

itself disconnected with all errors, is very simple, embracing merely the conviction of a spirit in man that continues beyond death, without any definite notion as to its nature and condition. All beyond this conviction was conjecture; even immortality was enigmatical. But conjecture was rife with its theories respecting souls, and their future condition — respecting angels and spirits, both good and evil; and their influence over men; and respecting the intercourse of souls in the body with spirits departed. Hence arose the magic arts of antiquity — hence the belief in divination and necromancy, and the reverence for magicians, enchanters, witches, consulters of familiar spirits, and other classes, who, it was thought, could evoke and hold communion with the shadowy forms of unearthly beings.[7]

The references, in the books of Moses, to these prevailing impressions, and the decided condemnation of magic, witchcraft, necromancy, and every form of divination, show, plainly enough, that the Jews at the very commencement of their commonwealth, had imbibed the same errors. It cannot be denied that they had some conceptions of disembodied beings — some faith in spirits in another world. They surely believed in angels and other spiritual existences. In close connection with the soul's continuance in a conscious state, they had formed the notion, in common with the neighboring nations, of a sort of subterranean world, the residence of departed spirits. Few will dispute that such a notion was entertained by the early Hebrews. *Sheol* was regarded a sort of shadowy world where the *manes* of the departed formed a vast congregation in conscious existence. This opinion distinctly assumed the doctrine of a continuance of souls, or of being, beyond this life.

Was this doctrine recognized in the Jewish Scriptures, especially in the five books of Moses? There are certainly indications in the writings of the Jewish lawgiver, not only that the doctrine prevailed among the people, but that it was recognized as a divine truth. Are there not some principles of revelation assumed in the sacred records, or taken for granted as true, without being directly and didactically asserted? It is, for instance, nowhere said, by way of original revelation, in the writings of Moses, that "there is a God;" but that affirmation is everywhere

[7] Jahn, Archæology, § 314.

Digitized by Google

assumed as a well-established and generally admitted truth. "In the beginning, God created the heavens and the earth," (Gen. i. 1.) Here, as elsewhere, there is a direct affirmation that God performed something; but no attempt to prove, or even to reveal that he exists. When he appeared to Moses in the burning bush, the historian constantly assumes, without asserting, the fact of his being. On this occasion he declared himself the God of Abraham, Isaac and Jacob; but Moses merely asked his name, without demanding any assertion of his existence or supremacy. Moses, however, was very particular in correcting the errors which the Jews might have gathered from Egypt and elsewhere, concerning the nature and character of God. Especially does he direct his institutions against idolatry. Monotheism, in contradistinction from the prevailing forms of polytheism, is very often asserted by the Jewish lawgiver. "Hear, O Israel, the Lord thy God is one Lord"—not many, (Deut. vi. 4.) "I," and no one else of all the tutelary deities of the age and country —"I am the Lord thy God, that brought thee out of Egypt," (Exodus xx. 1.) "Thou shalt have no other gods before me." Thus was Moses very cautious in correcting the great and prominent errors of the people; but, if I mistake not, he nowhere affirms, or denies that the one God exists. Still, the mode in which he refers to this Being is a sufficient recognition of his existence; and that recognition, therefore, becomes a truth of revelation.

Is not the existence of angels, or an order of beings superior to the human race, recognized in the same way? Every one knows that mention is very often made, in the holy Scriptures, of "angels," "his angel," "the angel of the Lord," and "the angel of God." And no one can doubt that in some instances, these phrases denote some sort of personal beings or agents, superior to men, and of a spiritual nature. The prevailing belief of the early Hebrews is clearly indicated in the record of Jacob's dream, (Gen. xxviii. 12.) It has indeed been maintained by some, that the phrase, "angel of the Lord," refers to Christ, as the second person in the trinity.[8] Others, however, have affirmed that it denotes a peculiar manifestation of the divine presence (especially in Genesis xvi. 7, et

[8] Hengstenberg's Christology, see Bib. Repos., vol. iii. p. 653.

Digitized by Google

seq.) to the various persons mentioned.[9] But this, with other similar phrases, is evidently applied more frequently to a superior order of beings, of whom the apostle says "They are all ministering spirits, sent forth to minister for them who shall be heirs of salvation."[10] Yet it is nowhere directly asserted that such an order of beings exist. Their existence is assumed as a well-known fact. The prevailing opinion is recognized; and as there is no condemnation of it, in any part of the sacred record, it becomes a truth of revelation. If it were condemned in any part of the divine word, although mentioned in other parts in a way to imply its reality, it could not be regarded as a revealed truth.

It is on this ground that the doctrine of evil angels is exploded as an erroneous theory. If I mistake not, the book of Job was designed as a direct condemnation of an opinion prevailing among the people, concerning the agency of evil angels in the affairs of man. At any rate, the apostle Paul declares, (1 Tim. iv. 1,) that "in the last times some shall depart from the faith, giving heed to seducing spirits and doctrines of devils"—"or rather, giving heed to erroneous spirits and doctrines concerning demons."[11] In mentioning this declension, he evidently condemns the doctrine concerning demons, which had prevailed in the world. The true principles of revelation do not embrace that doctrine. In this condemnation is embraced the whole system of Jewish demonology. Their opinions concerning *Diabolos*, *Samael*, and *Satan*, as well as *Daimonia*, are alike condemned. And hence, though the sacred writers often mention these in adaptation to common opinions and prejudices, it is not to be supposed that they are recognized as beings really existing in a sort of spiritual state. But while all such errors are clearly condemned, the existence of an order of superhuman beings — holy angels — is taken for granted, as true, with no subsequent condemnation.

Do not these remarks apply with equal force to the scriptural recognition of the soul as a distinct entity, and its continued existence after leaving the body? No one

[9] Stuart's Heb. Chrestomathy, p. 167. Christian Examiner, vol. xx. p. 219.

[10] Bush, Notes on Genesis xvi. 7.

[11] Newton on the Prophecies, vol. ii. p. 82.

Digitized by Google

can dispute that this was an article of common belief among the Jews from the commencement of their theocracy. Testimony the most conclusive on this point is to be found in the numerous scriptural references to witchcraft and necromancy, and in the severe laws enacted against them. Such laws would not have been enacted against necromancy, if that superstitious practice had not prevailed to an alarming extent among the people. Yet necromancy presupposes a belief that the spirits, or souls of the dead, continue in a conscious state of existence. The interview of Saul with the witch of Endor, does not prove that Samuel's spirit still existed in a conscious state; but it does prove the prevalence of a common faith to that effect.[12]

Was this common faith anywhere condemned by the commissioned lawgiver of the Jews? It is corrected; but is it condemned in any part of the sacred writings? It will be difficult to find a passage condemning the naked principle which forms so important a feature of the revelations of Christianity. It will be seen, hereafter, that Christ and his apostles taught the doctrine of a continued existence of the spirit beyond this life. And it cannot be supposed that any revelation made to mankind has condemned, as falsehood, a principle which Christianity recognizes as a fundamental truth. But though neither Moses nor any other sacred writer has condemned the belief that souls exist beyond this life; yet he has enacted severe laws against the various abuses of it. It was a striking feature of the legal dispensation to correct the errors of the people, and prepare them for the reception of truth. Moses was well aware of the errors which they had acquired in Egypt, and to which they would be exposed by their contiguity with the Canaanites and other nations. Consequently he enacted the following ordinance, (Deut. xviii. 9–12:) "When thou art come into the land which the Lord thy

[12] Bishop Warburton, (Divine Legation, book v. § 5,) contends that the doctrine of a future state was not taught in the writings and institutions of Moses, and that it seems never to have had any share in the people's thoughts; and yet he admits, (book vi.) that the patriarchs had some faith in it, which they derived from God's promises, contained in the Mosaic writings. Some of his assertions are singular and extravagant. No one can read the accounts of Jewish necromancy, without admitting that the people thought of a future life. Moses did not, indeed, directly *assert* the doctrine; but he has used language which surely implies some sort of life beyond the present state of being.

Digitized by Google

God giveth thee, thou shalt not learn to do after the abominations of those nations; there shall not be found among you any one that maketh his son or his daughter to pass through the fire, or that useth divination, or an observer of times, or an enchanter, or a witch, or a charmer, or a consulter with familiar spirits, or a wizard, or a necromancer. For all that do these things are an abomination unto the Lord." This divine ordinance assumes the prevalence, among the Canaanites, of the superstitious practices therein condemned. These are called "an abomination unto the Lord." The Israelites were forbidden to "do after the abominations of those nations," and were assured that, in consequence of the practice of them, the Lord would expel the original inhabitants from Canaan, and give that land as an inheritance to his chosen people. But many of these abominations sprang from abuses of the conviction that souls exist after their bodies are dissolved, and could not have been practised without such conviction. While, however, the abominations and malpractices were prohibited, the conviction itself was passed over in virtual approval, or at least without condemnation. By this course, the sacred writer, without directly affirming the doctrine that souls exist longer than the body, did at least give it some countenance and support.

It is not, however, a mere negative acknowledgment, which it receives in the Pentateuch, and other books of the Old Testament. It is more directly and positively recognized in them. It is true that Moses does not speak in direct and decisive language concerning the future state — the existence of human spirits beyond their earthly abode. The references which he makes to this subject are only brief hints, intelligible, perhaps, to those alone to whom a knowledge of it would be essentially beneficial.[13] He did not inculcate the *immortality* of the soul, except so far as immortality might be inferred from its continued existence after leaving the body. But, as will be seen in the sequel, he does very plainly *assume* that mind, or spirit, does not die, when its connection with the physical frame is dissolved. Several considerations from "Moses and the prophets," may be brought to show that there is

[13] Hengstenberg's Christ., vol. i. p. 35. Warburton, Divine Legation, book vi. § 5.

Digitized by Google

something in man, — soul or spirit, — which lives beyond the dissolution of body.

1. The idea is inculcated in all those passages which speak of the dead as "going to their fathers," as "sleeping with their fathers," &c. The ancient Hebrews regarded life as a journey, or a pilgrimage, which terminated at death; when the sojourner entered into the company of his ancestors.[14] Hence it is said of Ishmael, that having lived an hundred and thirty-seven years, "he gave up the ghost, and died, and was gathered to his fathers."—(Gen. xxv. 17.) Abraham, also, "gave up the ghost and died in a good old age, an old man and full of years, and was gathered to his people."—(Gen. xxv. 8.) Of a similar import is the language used with reference to Isaac's death: "He gave up the ghost, and died, and was gathered to his people, being old and full of days. And Esau and Jacob buried him."—(Gen. xxxv. 29.) Concerning Rachel, the language is peculiar: "And it came to pass, as her *soul was in departing*, (for she died,) that she called his name Benoni."—(Gen. xxxv. 18.) In all these passages, there is an evident intention to convey the idea that some sort of essence, or being, existing in the body, was departing from it; and yet that it lived, after its departure, to be gathered to the assembly of those who had gone before it. This being is not the body, and not the *breath* of life. It is that which constitutes personal identity — that to which the pronouns, *I*, *thou*, *me*, *he*, *self*, and others are appropriately applied. It may, indeed, be said that the expressions, in the passages above mentioned, are poetic figures, designed to convey the idea of natural death, without intimating any thing beyond. This explanation would be satisfactory, if there had been no previous conviction of the continued existence of the soul after leaving the body. But with such a belief, which the patriarchs unquestionably entertained in common with the Jews generally, the language could not be used without conveying the idea of spirit, or something else, departing from its temple, and still existing in a conscious state after death. Indeed, the imagery was evidently borrowed from the current belief of the age — a belief which Moses, so far from condemning, has, in its essential features, virtually approved.

[14] Jahn, Bib. Archæology, § 203.

Digitized by Google

It is not to be supposed that being "gathered to their fathers," denotes a particular ancestral burial-place. When the promise was made to Abraham, "Thou shalt go to thy fathers in peace; thou shalt be buried in a good old age," (Gen. xv. 15;) it was not certainly intended that his body should be laid by the graves of his ancestors; for he was buried in a cave near the plain of Mamre, at the south of Hebron. But his fathers lived, and died, and were buried, in the extensive country of the Chaldeans, beyond the Euphrates. The meaning of the promise, then, is that he should be gathered to the vast congregation of his departed ancestors, who were conceived of as yet alive and conscious of their condition. "When persons are said to go to their fathers, and go down to their children who were dead, nothing more seems to be meant than that they had gone to *Sheol* or *Hades*, where all the dead are represented as one vast congregation."[15] With these prevailing opinions, the Jews must, of necessity, conceive of that congregation as living in their unearthly state. The phraseology used with reference to it, was directly calculated to confirm the conviction of a conscious existence of human spirits beyond this life.

The figure of a sleep, made use of to denote death, would naturally add further confirmation of the prevailing belief. "The Lord said unto Moses, Behold, thou shalt sleep with thy fathers."—(Deut. xxxi. 16.) And the death of several kings of Israel, is recorded in the simple but pathetic language, "He slept with his fathers."[16] Sometimes the expression is varied by adding, "And they buried him in the city of David," or, "He was buried with his fathers in the city of David." This, it will be admitted, is a beautiful figure to express a naturally repulsive and gloomy fact. It conveys the idea of rest and peacefulness, and at the same time indicates a continued existence. The being who sleeps, is not wholly dead, but reposing in slumber, from which he shall again awake. The language, then, was calculated to strengthen the conviction that mind, or person, or the being who thinks, was not

[15] Balfour, Essays, p. 15.

[16] See 1 Kings ii. 10; xi. 21, 43; xiv. 20, 31; xv. 8, 24. 2 Kings viii. 24; xiii. 9; xv. 7. 2 Chron. xxvii. 9; xxviii. 27; xxxii. 33; xxxiii. 20.

Digitized by Google

annihilated at death; that, though he slept or rested in the land of darkness and forgetfulness; though he was gathered to the assembly of the dwellers in *Sheol;* yet he was still capable of thought and perception, of sympathy and affection. There was a degree of tenderness associated with this conviction, that rendered it the more pleasant and permanent. And perhaps it was strengthened by the impossibility of conceiving of beings annihilated. No man can conceive of himself as non-existent. When he makes the attempt, he invariably conceives of a being existing; and he vainly endeavors to associate, with this conception, the idea of absolute nothingness, and to include himself, or any other being, in that idea. He remembers his friends who have died; but the remembrance always includes the idea of living beings, either active or at rest. He conceives of them as they were when alive; and he cannot bring his thoughts down to the present, and conceive of them as gone, without carrying along with that conception, the idea of their existence. The memories of the past necessarily embrace and convey to the present, the living images of beings then existing and acting. It is this circumstance, perhaps, more than any thing else, which has strengthened the conviction that the dead are not annihilated, but, though taken from us, that they still exist in some mysterious region beyond the grave.

2. The Jewish views of *Sheol*, and the scriptural references to that subject, afford further evidence of an intention of the sacred writers to recognize the existence of the spirit after leaving the body. It cannot be questioned that *Sheol*, in the Old Testament, primarily denotes a dim region beneath the face of the earth — a world for the dead in general, without reference to their moral qualities, their happiness or misery. The uniform testimony of ancient and modern *savans* has fully established this as the meaning of the word.[17] It is derived from a root, (*shaal*,) which has "the import of craving, requiring, insatiable longing, from its being one of the four things which, Solomon says, are never satisfied."[18] It is translated *grave*, *pit*, and *hell;* but there is as wide a departure from the truth on the one

[17] See Stuart's Essays, p. 98. Campbell's Four Gospels, vol. i. p. 180. Balfour, First Inquiry, chap. i.

[18] Bush, Notes on Genesis xxxvii. 35.

Digitized by Google

hand, in assuming that it denotes merely the resting-place of the body, "exclusively the grave or place of burial,"[19] as there is, on the other, in maintaining that it denotes a state of punishment beyond this life. It was doubtless designed to express the rendezvous of the dead — a sort of underworld, where the spirits, or attenuated forms and shadowy images of the departed, were congregated in a state of conscious existence.[20] What we are able to learn of Jewish opinions shows conclusively that this people believed in the existence of spirits after death. In barbarous ages, they would naturally conceive of some locality for the residence of departed souls. And when this idea was once established, they would as naturally find a word to express it. Such a word they have in the Hebrew tongue — the word *Sheol.* "The popular notion was, that *Sheol* was a deep region in the earth where the ghosts of the dead all resided."[21] "The belief of the ancient Hebrews was, that the spirits of the dead were received into *Sheol,* which is represented as a large subterranean abode."[22] But they could have no sort of belief or notion of the residence of such unearthly images, without conceiving of them as *existing*, and conscious of their existence in that region.

With such a word in common use, and such a meaning conveyed by it, who can believe it possible for the sacred writers to employ it without recalling to the minds of the people their old convictions — without suggesting the idea of human souls, or spirits, existing in *Sheol?* In what way do they employ the word, and how do they appear to have been understood?

The first place where *Sheol* is used in the Bible, if I am not mistaken, is Genesis xxxvii. 35, where Jacob, mourning for Joseph, refused to be comforted and said, "For I will go down into the grave (*Sheol*) unto my son mourning." It was but a little while before, (Gen. xxxv. 20,) that the historian, recording the death and burial of

[19] Universalist Quarterly, vol. i. p. 367.

[20] Mr. Balfour denies that the dead were conscious in *Sheol;* but it is certain that the people conceived of them as existing and conscious, and used the word to express that idea.

[21] Balfour, First Inquiry, p. 56.

[22] Jahn, Bib. Archæology, § 314.

Digitized by Google

Rachel, made use of another word (*keber*) to denote her grave, or burial-place. It was evidently something different that he wished to express by the word *Sheol.* The aged mourner believed that his son rested in that mysterious and dimly disclosed existence; and, however sad the reflection, yet, in his sorrow, he desired to go down and join him there. Can it be supposed that he regarded him as utterly unconscious of any existence? His very wish to go down unto him, indicates his conviction that *Sheol* contained the living spirit, or *effigiem*, of his departed son. There are a few other passages where *Sheol* is used with reference to the death of Jacob, and doubtless with its common signification.[23] Do they not contain a recognition of something in man that continues to exist after death? The holy Scriptures do not sanction any errors respecting *Sheol* and its inhabitants, connected with this conviction. All errors are corrected, and the truth alone respecting the soul's continuance, is sanctioned, by the later revelations of Christianity.

It is not necessary to examine all the passages where *Sheol* occurs in the Old Testament. The word is often used figuratively, sometimes to denote the sepulchre, but oftener, perhaps, to signify some peculiar state of the people in this world. Still its prevailing usage clearly indicates an invisible world for the shades or spirits of the dead. Thus in 1 Sam. ii. 6, "The Lord killeth and maketh alive; he bringeth down to the grave, (*Sheol*,) and he bringeth up." The very language here employed assumes the continued existence of the thing brought down to *Sheol* and brought up again. So when Job says, "O that thou wouldst hide me in the grave," (*Sheol*,) considering the prevalent meaning of the word, he could not have used it without referring to an invisible region where he hoped to be at rest, yet conscious of his quiet.

But this idea is confirmed by another class of texts, which contain the Hebrew word *rephaim* in connection with *Sheol.* According to Gesenius, this word in the singular, (*rapha*,) signifies "*beings relaxed, feeble, languid;*" and in the plural, (*rephaim*,) denotes "*the weak*," and designates "*the manes* or *shades* dwelling in Hades, whom the Hebrews supposed to be destitute of blood, and animal

[23] Gen. xlii. 38; xliv. 29, 31.

Digitized by Google

life, and, therefore, weak and languid, like sick persson; but not wholly without some faculties of mind."[24] Poetical imagery has given life and animation to the dwellers in *Sheol*, and invested them with the costumes of the living. Poetry, however, is but an echo of prevailing tastes and opinions. These, then, are the creative power which, out of a fundamental truth, have constructed the attenuated forms or manes of the departed. And does not inspiration, by its very reference to the poetic creations, sanction the fundamental truth? Amid the drapery of *rephaim* and *Sheol*, with which the sacred writers have invested their thoughts, do they not recognize the continued existence of the soul beyond this life, out of which the poetic fictions have sprung? There is seldom a fiction that has not some reality for its foundation. The fictions concerning *Sheol* and its inhabitants must have had their groundwork in a primary truth, which truth is confirmed by the very prevalence of the fictions.

Among the texts referred to is the passage in Job xxvi. 5, 6.

> "Before him the *shades* beneath tremble,
> The waters and their inhabitants;
> The underworld is naked before thee;
> Destruction is without a covering."[25]

Whether the representation here were fiction or reality, it must necessarily confirm a superstitious people in their convictions relative to *Sheol* and the "*shades*," (*rephaim*,) and it seems designed to sanction the great truth that lay at the bottom of them. A further recognition of the same truth is found in the language of the Psalmist, (Ps. lxxxviii. 10, 11,) when the questions are asked implying the strongest negations. "Wilt thou show wonders to the dead (*metim?*) Shall the dead (*rephaim*) arise and praise thee? Shall thy loving-kindness be declared in the grave, (*keber?*)" Here the *dead* mentioned in the first interrogation are very different from the *rephaim* in the second. In the third, *keber* is used denoting grave in a sense different from *Sheol*. While, then, the dead (*metim*) in the first question denotes dead bodies, *rephaim* in the second must

[24] Hebrew and English Lexicon in verbo רָפָא. See also Stuart's Essays.

[25] See Noyes' Translation of Job.

Digitized by Google

have been designed to express the souls or *manes* of the departed, the supposed living residents of *Sheol.* There is another passage to the same effect, in the prophecy of Isaiah, (xiv. 9.) "Hell from beneath is moved for thee to meet thee at thy coming. It stirreth up the dead (*rephaim*) for thee, even all the chief ones of the earth. It hath raised up from their thrones all the kings of the nations." The prophet, in this connection, was predicting the fall of the Babylonian empire, and the deliverance of the Jews from their long captivity. The king of Babylon, addressed as "Lucifer, son of the morning," was to experience a terrible humiliation and death. So great was the victim to be received into *Sheol*, among its spectral inhabitants, that *Sheol* itself was moved at his coming, and the dead, *rephaim*, ghosts, or *umbræ* of earth's mighty departed, were disquieted at his presence.[26] But however figurative this passage may be, and whatever errors its literal interpretation may involve, it certainly adds another to the numerous scriptural evidences that *Sheol* was regarded as the receptacle of the spirits of departed men, which were alive and conscious in their unearthly abode. The errors connected with this opinion are corrected by the clearer light of the Christian revelation; but this correction does not presuppose that the opinion itself is wholly false in all its parts. The continued existence of the soul, so clearly recognized in this passage, is fully affirmed by Christ and his apostles as a truth from God.

There are some other passages belonging to the same class, which it is not necessary to quote at length. They set forth not only a world for the dead, but the dead also as having life, consciousness, and shadowy forms in that world. And however erroneous may be the representations, there is evidently an important truth lying at the bottom of them, which forms a part of revelation, namely, the conscious existence of mind, or soul, in some condition beyond this life.

3. Another evidence of the same truth, in the Old Testament, is derived from the use of the words which are rendered life, breath, soul, and spirit; namely, *nephish*, *ruah*, and others. All these, in their primary meaning, seem to have some reference to air or breath; and were,

[26] See Lowth's Translation of Isaiah, p. 216.

Digitized by Google

probably, first applied to animated beings in consequence of the movement of air that was observed during the act of respiration. But they were subsequently employed with almost every variety of analogous signification, denoting life, breath, wind, passions, emotions, persons, self, mind and spirit.[27] No one can doubt that they are sometimes used to denote the mind, its faculties and affections, as distinguished from the body. But their more common signification is animal life, the vital principle or sensitive soul, common alike to man and beast.

It has already been shown that the Jews, in early times, had some conception of a rational spirit distinct from the human body. As this conception ripened into a conviction, and prevailed extensively among the people, it was very natural for them to find some word to express it. But the subject, in its more recondite relations, was not to be comprehended without difficulty. It is not surprising, therefore, that mankind, in the rudest ages, should have had but an imperfect idea of the nature and properties of the soul. Their knowledge of it was derived from a few of its most striking outward manifestations. And so intimately was it associated with the vital principle, that it might have been regarded as the cause of life. The people saw and felt that when the living subject breathed, the mind and its affections retained their ascendency. But when the breath departed, when the "ghost was given up," all these ceased their action, or at least were no longer manifested in the lifeless subject. The difficulty of forming an accurate idea of an invisible spirit, and the necessary relationship of breath to the living and rational man, would very naturally induce the supposition that mind, with its wonderful powers and affections, resided in the breath, and, perhaps, was identical with it. Hence, doubtless, originated the use of words denoting *breath*, in the language of the Hebrews, to signify soul, mind, or the inner spirit which constitutes the true man. That people had not then learned all the metaphysical distinctions of a later age, between the *vegetative* soul, the *sensitive* soul, and the *rational* soul. Consequently they might have believed, like the Egyptians, that rational souls were common both to men and beasts, and were capable of transmigration from one

[27] See The Soul, or Scriptural Psychology, by Professor Bush.

Digitized by Google

to the other. This doctrine, however, is nowhere mentioned in the Scriptures, and, of consequence, nowhere sanctioned by divine revelation. But the people unquestionably did conceive of the *vital* and the rational spirit as either identical, or, at least, so nearly analogous, as to be expressed by the same word. And consequently, the Hebrew words usually translated soul and spirit, are often applied both to the vital principle, and to the mind with powers and affections. Instances are very numerous, but they need not be quoted at length. It will be proper, however, to adduce a few passages in which the words appear to have a higher signification than mere animal life. In Genesis xxiii. 8, the word *nephesh* is used, where Abraham said to the children of Heth, "If it be *your mind* that I should bury my dead, hear me;" that is, if you will give your *consent;* yet the granting of this, would necessarily require the exercise of a rational principle. "If thou shalt seek the Lord thy God, thou shalt find him, if thou seek him with all thy heart and all thy soul."—(Deut. iv. 29.) "Thou shalt love the Lord thy God, with all thy heart and all thy soul."—(Deut. vi. 5.) "Know thou the God of thy father, and serve him with a perfect heart and a willing *mind*," or *soul*.—(1 Chron. xxviii. 9.) In these instances the word *nephesh* certainly denotes something more than animal vitality. It refers to the affections, purposes, and actions of the mind; and of consequence, the use of it recognizes the existence of a rational principle in man, which governs the actions of the body.

In like manner, when this word has the signification of *self* and *person*, it contains a necessary reference to the *mind* as constituting the *being* designated by those words, "O my soul, come not thou into their secret," (Gen. xlix. 6.) This is but a sample of many similar passages with which the Scriptures abound, but which need not be quoted at length. The phrases *my soul*, *thy soul*, *his soul*, *their souls*, and kindred expressions, refer to the inner man, to that wonderful principle which constitutes personal identity; for identity cannot be predicated of body, because body is constantly changing. Neither can it be predicated of thought, if there is no thinking principle distinct from physical organization. It is mind, the enduring, thinking substance or essence—mind, the conscious self, or soul,

Digitized by Google

which constitutes the changeless *monad*—the single identical being that is felt to be the same through all the fluctuations of its existence. The Hebrews believed in some such principle in man. And as they thought it to be in some way connected with life and breath, would they not very naturally make use of a word to express it, which, at the same time, might express what they would regard as correlative ideas? They unquestionably did so, in the use of the word *nephesh.*

But this is not the only word employed in a similar way. *Ruah*, usually translated *spirit*, has the primary signification of breath, but passes from that, by an easy transition, to denote both the vital principle and the rational soul. No one, probably, will question the truth of this remark. The following passages are a sample. "Thy visitation hath preserved my spirit."—(Job x. 12.) "And it came to pass in the morning that his spirit was troubled."—(Gen. xli. 8.) "But there is a spirit in man, and the inspiration of the Almighty giveth him understanding."—(Job xxxii. 8.) These are but a sketch of what might be quoted, but they show that the word was used to denote something different from breath, and more than animal life. In the last passage, the spirit evidently means the principle or substance which thinks, and is capable of receiving the understanding which the Almighty gives. In many passages, the word denotes the passions, emotions, disposition, and temper of the mind. In this case, it distinctly recognizes the existence of a spiritual essence, the seat and subject of these passions and emotions. Of this class are the following: "In whose spirit there is no guile."—(Ps. xxxii. 2.) "The Lord saveth such as be of a contrite spirit."—(Ps. xxxiv. 18.) "Renew a right spirit within me."—(Ps. li. 10.) Further quotations are unnecessary. The reader is referred to a work on "*The Soul*," lately published by Professor Bush.

It may be deemed indisputable, then, that the Hebrews did employ the words above mentioned, to convey the idea of a spirit existing in man distinct from his body. No matter how incorrect were their views. It is certain that their psychology embraced a rational soul, capable of thought and feeling, and having power to exist separate from the flesh. Would it not, then, be natural for a peo-

Digitized by Google

ple, with such impressions, when speaking of death, to refer to this principle as departing from its tenement? That they did conceive of it in this way, and refer to it in this way, is evident from the sacred records. The following passages, among others, confirm this remark. "His *breath* (*spirit*) goeth forth, he returneth to the earth; in that very day his thoughts (*counsels*) perish."—(Ps. cxlvi. 4.) "Into thy hands I commit my *spirit*."—(Ps. xxxi. 5.) "No man hath power over the *spirit* to retain the *spirit*, neither hath he power in the day of death."—(Eccl. viii. 8.) These passages evidently refer to something which goes forth at death, and which no man can retain. It may be the vital breath; but when it had gone, and the man lay lifeless and senseless as the ground from which he came, a rude people would naturally regard it as a departure of the rational spirit. And the use of such language, by the prophets, would be calculated to confirm such an impression.

4. The errors which had been involved in this ancient idea, and the obscurity which rested on the subject, were removed by the clearer light of Christianity. No one will doubt that Christ and his apostles revealed a resurrection of the dead. There might have been a few instances of the revivification of deceased persons, before the era of the Christian dispensation, and a protraction, in this world, of the life thus restored. But there had been no disclosure of a resurrection like that revealed by the Son of God. All that was known of man's condition beyond this life, was embraced in that small portion of truth, which, out of the current opinions concerning the soul and its residence in *Sheol*, had been sanctioned by the sacred writers. To the records of the Christian dispensation, therefore, application must be made for a full development of the doctrine of the resurrection of the dead.

But in disclosing the fact and the nature of the resurrection, do the writers of these records necessarily disaffirm and invalidate all prior convictions concerning the future? They certainly make no direct denial of the soul's continued life after leaving its earthly tenement. On the other hand, is not this idea virtually, if not directly and positively, reaffirmed? Does not the very announcement that "there shall be a resurrection," presuppose a continuance of the spirit's life after the dissolution of the body?

Digitized by Google

At any rate, the thing that is to be raised, as will be seen hereafter, whatever it may be, does not entirely cease its existence. Is this the body? There are certainly very strong and conclusive reasons that may be urged against the resurrection of the material body — the same body that is dissolved when death ensues. Professor Bush has nearly exhausted this subject, and shown, beyond the possibility of refutation, that identity is not an attribute of the body; it does not exist in any arrangement of the material elements; and that no man can be raised with the same physical body in which his spirit, or *self*, exists in this world.[28] But without discussing this question, it may be assumed that the material body is not to be honored with a resurrection.

What, then, is to be raised from the dead? It is mind or spirit — that enduring essence in which the proper identity of the person exists. If this be the case, then the mind or spirit is not extinguished — not lost or annihilated at death. Though it must undergo that change, in its relations to outward things, which is called death; yet it does not, thereby, cease to exist. If there should be an entire cessation of its existence — an utter extinction of the whole man or person, body, soul, spirit, mind, identity; there could be no resurrection. God may be able, indeed, to create new beings; but not to raise up *old ones*, unless there be something belonging to the old ones yet undissolved and existing, to be raised to a higher state. If, then, the person shall be the same hereafter as here — if the soul shall retain its identity in the resurrection, it must continue to exist through all the changes of its condition prior to that glorious era. The very idea of a resurrection — *anastasis*, or *standing up again* — necessarily presupposes the continuance of the thing raised — of mind or spirit, undying and undecaying, beyond this life. No power can call from nonentity the lost being, and make it the same, for there can be nothing left to form the subject of a resurrection.

What then, constitutes the resurrection? It is not the resuscitation of a dead soul; nor the re-formation of a spirit from its dissolved and scattered spiritual elements; nor yet the awaking of the soul from a long, deep, dreary

[28] See Anastasis, pp. 31–92.

Digitized by Google

and dreamless sleep! But, in a metaphysical sense, it is the great change which takes place in the *condition* and *relations* of the soul. What is death? Every scriptural representation seems to indicate that it is a departure of the living spirit from its earthly temple. Through every period of the Hebrew commonwealth, this idea prevailed among the people. It is very similar to the impression which prevails at the present time. And this idea seems to be recognized as a truth, by the writers of both the Old and New Testaments, in their references to the giving up of the ghost. When the Redeemer was nailed to the cross, his biographer states that "he cried and yielded up the ghost,"—*pneuma.*—(Matt. xxvii. 50.) So, likewise, the prayer of Stephen, (Acts viii. 59,)—"Lord Jesus, receive my *spirit*," shows clearly enough the conviction of this sainted martyr, that his spirit (*pneuma*,) was about to depart from his body; and that, he doubtless felt, was death. There was a thing, therefore, conceived of, as departing from the body; and this, in the Scriptures, is recognized as a separate being. If, then, such is death, what is the resurrection? Is it not clear that it must have some reference to this departure of the spirit? Is it not the return of the departing spirit to the inheritance of some sort of body? It is certain that there is "a natural body, and there is a spiritual body." And an inspired apostle has affirmed, with reference to the dead, "It is sown a natural body; it is raised a spiritual body."—(1 Cor. xv. 44.) That the word spiritual (*pneumatikos*) has, in this passage, a metaphysical, and not a *moral* sense, is evident from the fact that, in the latter sense, it is wholly inapplicable to *body;* for body, without the mind or spirit, has no moral feeling.[29] It is the mind or soul of man, and that alone,

[29] Professor Bush affirms that "the apostle is here expressly contrasting the σωμα ψυχικον, *natural body*, with σωμα πνευματικον, *spiritual body*, in moral rather than metaphysical respects;" and the words, therefore, should be understood accordingly. It must be confessed, however, that such a declaration from such a writer, is somewhat surprising, not because it is new, but because it is so apparently opposed to the facts in the case. The whole drift of the apostle's argument seems clearly to show that he was speaking concerning a change of *elements*, not of character, and presenting the contrast between the *material* or essence of the present and the future body. "How are the dead raised, and with what body do they come?" Not

Digitized by Google

which is the seat and subject of all moral affections. The body is a mere instrument through which the spirit is able to manifest itself, and hold communion with other spirits or minds — a sort of temple, in which it lives and acts, and looks out upon the outward world.[30] The language of the apostle, then, shows that, as death is merely a departure of the spirit from its earthly body; so the resurrection is the return of the same spirit or mind to dwell in that spiritual body prepared for its reception. And this surely implies that there must be something existing to return again, and stand up, or be elevated to a higher condition in a glorious body; something which, on its departure, retains the identity of its being in a disembodied state, and bears back the consciousness of that identity into the spiritual *vehiculum* prepared for it. This idea seems to stand out prominently in the general argument of Paul on the resurrection of the dead.—(1 Cor. xv.)

The same idea is conveyed both by Paul and other apostles, in various portions of the sacred word. The

surely with a mere *moral* body, or a body morally glorious; for such qualities appertain only to the mind as the seat of moral affections. He evidently intended to ask what kind of substance or essence shall compose the future body? That which thou sowest, dies; but God giveth it a body. So with the dead. Cast into the earth with a material body, they are to be raised differently, with a most refined and subtile body, composed of spiritual elements, and fitted for the indwelling of the perfected mind. The following context shows that this was his meaning. (1 Cor. xv. 35–56.) The first body is earthly, composed of material elements; the second is heavenly or spiritual. The first cannot dwell in the condition of the second. "Flesh and blood cannot inherit the kingdom of God; neither doth corruption inherit incorruption." "The mortal must put on immortality." All this seems conclusive in showing that σωμα πνευματικον is to be taken in a metaphysical and not a moral sense. So the Christian fathers believed. See Macknight, on the Epistles. Locke, on 1 Corinthians. Rosenmüller, Scholia, in loco. Beza, in Nov. Testamentum.

[30] The new vagary of Professor Bush, that the ψυχη or *vital principle*, is a sort of shell or "involucrum" for the πνευμα; and that after death, it is to grow up into a spiritual or physical body for the glorified spirit, is hardly worth a confutation. It seems perfectly harmless. It may be satisfactory to some minds in accounting for the difference between men and brutes; and though it gives souls to the latter, yet these are *seeds* without immortality — mere blasted *psyches!* But such a principle as the germ of a future body is both unnecessary and unrecognized in the Scriptures. God can and will give a new body constructed of spiritual elements, according to his pleasure, as at first he gave the natural body.

Digitized by Google

following passages among others, may be quoted. "For we know that, if our earthly house of this tabernacle were dissolved, we have a building of God, a house not made with hands, eternal in the heavens."—(2 Cor. v. 1.) "Yea, I think it meet, as long as I am in this tabernacle, to stir you up. . . . knowing that I must shortly put off this tabernacle."—(2 Peter i. 13.) What is the earthly house, or "this tabernacle," but the material body? And who constitute the *I* and *we* that inherit the earthly tabernacle which may be dissolved? Does not the apostle refer to the spiritual part, the mind, or soul, that dwells in the body? It seems hardly possible to doubt that he speaks here of intellectual identity — the conscious soul that is capable of existing separate from the body. What, then, is "the building of God," of which he speaks, as our inheritance after leaving the earthly tabernacle? It is evidently that spiritual body, (*soma pneumatikon*,) of which he had treated at some length, in his former epistle. But the "*we*" are mentioned as distinct, both from the earthly and the heavenly house. In 2 Cor. v. 4, the apostle declares that the same "*we* that are in this tabernacle, do groan, being burdened, not for that we would be unclothed, but clothed upon"—"clothed upon with our house which is from heaven"—"that mortality might be swallowed up of life." Can any thing be plainer than the language here used? The metaphor is changed from a *house* to vestments; but still there is the necessary recognition of a continuing spirit, separate from the outward covering, to be unclothed and clothed upon. There is a thing existing — a conscious self — that goes out of its earthly dwelling and into its house not made with hands; that puts off its mortal vesture, and is clothed with celestial garments. This whole passage, then, whatever efforts may have been made to change its meaning, does conclusively prove the existence of a living spirit which, after leaving the body, shall be clothed with glorious vestments, or invested with a spiritual vehicle, a celestial body.[31]

[31] Vide Harmmond. Annotations on 2 Cor. v. 1.

Hic locus (2 Cor. v. 1) videtur confirmare hypothesin de evolutione corporis subtilioris statim post mortem inchoanda. (Rosenmüller, Scholia, in loco.) But it does not show that the new spiritual body is eliminated from the vital elements (*anima*) of the living being, when

Digitized by Google

Thus far, then, the evidence derived from the Christian oracles, avails to prove the existence of a spirit in man, which death cannot annihilate; which continues, perhaps, disembodied, until invested with a spiritual vehicle, and raised to a higher condition. And this evidence serves to confirm the great truth respecting the soul's continuance, which the Jewish Scriptures have, in some measure, set forth and sanctioned in their frequent references to the spirit and its abode in *Sheol.* It sanctions no errors concerning *Sheol* into which the people had fallen, and which had been mentioned, without correction, by the Jewish writers; but it does show that the general impressions respecting another life, had some foundation in fact. There was a *groundwork* of truth, however fanciful might have been the superstructures built upon it. And it cannot be questioned that the early inspired writers intended to sanction every thing that was true, in the current opinions, in reference to the soul and its future condition.

But nothing which has yet been said has had any particular reference to another great question that is answered by the Christian revelation. The Jewish Scriptures evidently assume the existence of a *soul* more permanent and enduring than its temple, the body. But the inquiry is equally important, Is that soul immortal? This question receives no affirmative answer, in the records of the Old Testament. Though conjecture, embracing the soul's immortality, in connection with the doctrine of metempsychosis, might have prevailed to some extent amid the speculations of philosophy; yet there is no allusion to this idea in the Jewish Scriptures, and of consequence, it remained unrevealed until the dawn of Christianity. But what are the utterings of the Christian system on this subject? It is admitted, by all who embrace it, that immortality is announced as the portion of every being in the resurrection. Opinion, however, is divided on the question whether it is a primitive attribute of the soul, or a gift communicated by a higher power after man has begun his existence. But the weight of scriptural evidence seems to indicate that it is a primitive attribute, entering essentially into the composi-

that being passes to the grave. The antithesis indicates that we shall receive from God a new body of celestial elements, which shall never die.

Digitized by Google

tion of the human spirit at its creation. A passage confirming this remark, may be found in 2 Tim. i. 10, where Paul announces, to his fellow-disciples, the grace of God, "made manifest by the appearing of our Saviour Jesus Christ, who hath abolished death, and brought life and immortality to light through the gospel." This declaration was evidently made concerning something *disclosed*, not *created* nor *communicated* — something which had existed as a fact, in prior ages, but was then, for the first time, brought to light, or revealed to the world. The *life* here mentioned as distinguished from immortality, was unquestionably that spiritual life which was "hid with Christ in God" — or the "mystery that was hid from ages and generations;" or, again, the kingdom of God, a dispensation of righteousness called *everlasting life*, and designed to effect the regeneration and ultimate obedience of all mankind. But the *immortality* brought to light was evidently something different from life. Was it not an attribute of the soul, which, though a subject of conjecture, had never before received the divine sanction as a fundamental article of religious truth? Immortality of some beings was brought to light; but not surely the immortality of angels, or of beings in another sphere of action. It was the immortality of mankind. But this could not have been disclosed, unless it had been possessed as an inherent attribute of the soul, prior to its disclosure — before the appearing of Christ.

Is it any marvel that the soul should be immortal, and its possessor know it not? How long is it, since a close and persevering chemical analysis has disclosed the primary elements of the human body? But is it any more true, now, that the outward temple of the soul is composed of oxygen, carbon, hydrogen, iron, lime, phosphorus and other elements in chemical combination, than it was during that long dim period of fruitless speculation, in which the world had not even dreamed of the wonderful and useful developments which modern chemistry has made? Revelation has disclosed a great fact relative to the *inner* man, showing its continuance beyond the transient scenes of this world. But it was left for man himself to discover, as best he could, the elements of his outward being, which must soon dissolve and enter into new organizations.

Digitized by Google

Nor does the assertion that "God only hath immortality," (1 Tim. vi. 16,) furnish any ground for denying the original immortality of the human soul. It is not true in point of fact, that, at the time when that language was used by the apostle, no being but God had immortality. Unquestionably there were spiritual beings called *angels*, who, long before the apostle's day, possessed the same attribute. And surely it was long before this time, that Christ had arisen and ascended to a state where he could experience "no more death," and where, in respect to his outward vehicle, he had been formed "after the power of an endless life," (Heb. vii. 16.) The meaning of the passage, then, is — not that no other being but God is immortal — but that no other being hath underived immortality — none but God hath the attribute in and of himself. Every other being derives its immortality, like its existence, from the great Fountain of all things. And the Scriptures surely present strong indications that this Being, in creating human souls, has endowed them with the same attribute.

The souls, then, or spirits of men, are created immortal, but they are required to dwell for a time in transient and dissolving bodies. The apostle, however, seems to show that they are ultimately to be invested with bodies of an essence similar to their own, to which will be communicated the attribute of immortality. "This corruptible must put on incorruption, and this mortal must put on immortality," (1 Cor. xv. 53.) The same idea is unquestionably conveyed by another passage, (2 Cor. v. 1–4,) where the soul is represented as putting off its earthly house and putting on its house from heaven. In the latter passage, therefore, the apostle fully explains what he means by the former. He speaks of "the corruptible" and "the mortal," in the use of metonymy, referring doubtless to the spirit that dwells in a corruptible, mortal, and dissolving vehicle; but this spirit, he affirms, must be invested with something immortal. It must be disrobed of its decaying garments, and clothed upon with its immortal vesture — leaving its earthly temple, it must enter into its "house not made with hands." In other words, the immortal and incorruptible must supervene upon the transient and perishable. The Lord Jesus "shall change

Digitized by Google

our vile body, that it may be fashioned like unto his glorious body, according to the working whereby he is able to subdue all things unto himself," (Phil. iii. 20.) And is not that change of body like the changing of garments — a putting off of the old and fading, and a putting on of the new and glorious? Such surely appears to be the meaning of the apostle; and it shows that a spiritual and immortal vehicle shall succeed the material and decaying body which the soul at present inherits. It was not the spirit that was to receive this new attribute; for the spirit is already immortal. But it was to be invested with a body similar to itself in nature and properties; and this of course must be immortal.

When that event shall have transpired, man will have entered upon an existence peculiar and glorious, which is sometimes called a "state of immortality." Still the attribute itself belongs solely to the being in his inward and outward nature, and not to the peculiar *state* in which he is placed. No matter what may be his condition; if the soul and its spiritual vehicle are immortal, man, the being, is in a state of immortality. The attribute, however, has no inseparable connection with the *moral* condition. Man is not necessarily perfect, because his soul and its spiritual vesture are immortal. It is true that in the resurrection, "they neither marry nor are given in marriage, neither can they die any more, but are equal unto the angels, and are the children of God, being the children of the resurrection," (Luke xx. 35, 36.) But it is not the mere outward change — the act of resurrection, the passage out of the mortal body, and entrance into the spiritual house, which makes them children of God. A moral change is necessary to bring the soul into that peculiar relationship. This, however, is digression, which cannot be pursued farther. Immortality is predicted of spirits raised from the dead, in the assertion that they "cannot die any more." And further, when the soul enters into its spiritual body, it takes the similitude of celestial beings; not necessarily *equal* to them, but *like angels*, (ισαγγελλοι);[32] and therefore immortal. Are not angels immortal, both in their intellectual

[32] The word evidently denotes resemblance, *not equality*. So in Matt. xxii. 30, "They are ως αγγελλοι *as the angels*," &c. There is no reference to equality. Similitude is far from implying it.

Digitized by Google

essence, and the attenuated spiritual *vehiculum*, in which it dwells? No one will dispute the fact. It is doubtless the possession of this attribute which, in one respect, renders the human spirit, in its immortal vehicle, "as the angels of God in heaven."

It is not necessary to proceed farther with the examination of scriptural evidences which tend to the development of this subject. Nor will it be possible to notice the many objections which, perhaps, will spring up spontaneously in minds accustomed to take a different view of the great question discussed in the foregoing pages. The conclusion of the whole matter is, that the Scriptures do teach the existence of a principle in man called soul, mind, or spirit, which is immortal. R. O. W.

Art. III.

Martineau's "Endeavors after the Christian Life."

The author of a good book upon practical religion is truly a benefactor of society; for upon no subject is a strong desire for instruction so imperfectly satisfied. We are told that men have the Bible, which is sufficient for their spiritual guidance; but so long as ignorance exists, even the word of God requires much illustration and explanation. The instructions of Christ were given in the form of universal principles; their application left to the judgment of every reader. It is one thing to know that sin is hateful to God, and another to understand what is sin in relation to our own character and circumstances. Even after the reason has drawn, from an honest examination of Scripture, a consistent system of doctrine, the equally important work of application remains. To bring the Bible into actual contact with the soul; to put one "in communication" with its divine contents; to explain how its instructions apply to individual action; to purify the spiritual vision that it may discover the beautiful adaptation of the gospel morality to the soul of man; and discern the very point where the sense of want and the divine supply, meet,—this is the noblest and most difficult portion of religious instruction.

Digitized by Google

A mere glance at the condition of theological literature will satisfy any man of its poverty in this department. The labors of clerical writers have been almost exclusively directed to expositions of doctrine; and it is easy to account for this. Any man, with good sense and a moderate share of learning, can deduce a theological system from a careful examination of scriptural texts. The doctrines of the trinity, the vicarious atonement, and the everlasting wrath of Jehovah, are illusions that rapidly disappear before a correct interpretation of holy writ, and a judicious use of reason. But it is a different thing to apply the precepts of Infinite Wisdom to every-day practice. He who would instruct his fellow-men in religious duty, is but half qualified, if he come to the work with a mere knowledge of technical theology. The moral nature of man is of all instruments the most delicate; and he alone, who knows its secret strings, can draw forth a divine harmony. How shall a man, whose soul never melted into tears, minister to the wants of a sensitive, faltering being? How shall he, who never knew what a fearful thing it is to be "tempted of the devil," understand him whose whole existence has been a death-struggle between evil passion and good resolution? The soul of a sinful man is in a state of disease and languor; but the treatment of those who profess to be its ministers, is too often like that of the physician, who should turn his patient out of doors, and require of him the labor of a strong man. Many men have never discovered that different moral diseases require a corresponding difference of treatment. The same exhortation is thundered out to the saint and sinner, the sensitive and phlegmatic, the humble penitent and the proud offender. It is all sin, and in God's name it is all cursed.

Such being the great difficulties in the way of effectual religious instruction, we cannot wonder that the spiritual wants of men are so scantily supplied; especially, when we consider that almost every man, who has been deeply interested in Christianity, has given to the world the results of his meditations. Men, whose ignorance of the true spirit of Christ, has only been equalled by their ignorance of the nature of man, in whom an artificial conscience has nursed the seeds of formality, and a burning zeal created a sense of infallibility, have ever been ready to warn man-

Digitized by Google

kind to "flee from the wrath to come." The consequence has been a perversion of the public taste, and a plentiful harvest of bigotry and artificial sentiment. The idea of religion has insensibly become associated with a conscience inquisitive about trifles, a state of morbid sentimentality, and an excited, spiritual exaltation. When "Hervey's Meditations" lies next the Bible in every pious woman's library, the indication is significant.

It is refreshing to turn from the religious books that fill our public libraries, to the little work before us. We can truly say, we regard "The Endeavors after the Christian Life" as the best work upon practical religion, we have ever read. It consists of twenty-two short discourses upon various subjects, and is replete with all that should commend a book to the esteem of a good man.

The author of this work has long been known as one of that noble band of English clergymen, who have labored so strongly for liberal principles under the frown of bigotry and persecution. "The Rationale of Religious Enquiry," a series of six powerfully written lectures, upon the "Method of obtaining Answers to the Question, What is Christianity?" a portion of the discourses in the "Liverpool Controversy;" with many others, denoting great ability, are too well known to require comment. As a controversial writer, Martineau is distinguished by a happy illustration of the great points of discussion. His mind seizes the grand turning-point in the question, and all the wealth of his intellect and imagination is thrown upon it.

His style, as a writer of sermons, is admirable. Luxuriant and abounding in the most vivid illustration, we yet never feel it to be unworthy the subject. He abounds in those choice expressions which come to a man in his moments of intensest thought, like words of inspiration, and find a response in every heart. Although finished in the highest degree, his sermons never are destitute of that glow which comes only from a soul filled with genuine religious emotion. Perhaps the fastidious in such matters, might condemn his abundance of metaphor and affluence of diction, but we confess it appears to us an indispensable requisite in popular address.

The great purpose in oral religious instruction, is to impart certain ideas to the hearer in the most effectual man-

Digitized by Google

ner. He who attempts it, will be fortunate, if by any exertion, he can fasten upon the mind a few simple ideas, or a single train of reflection, at one effort. To deny, therefore, to the preacher, a generous use of metaphors and a glow of expression almost bordering upon the poetical, is to disarm him of his most effectual weapons. We are no advocates for rant, but we do love to hear men speak out earnestly the truth that fills their hearts. There is a class of critics who value a sermon only by the studied and precise elegance of its style. Every illustration must be in classical form, every strong expression emptied of its significance, and every prompting of generous enthusiasm crushed in its first appearance. But we can see no good reason for admitting the justice of such criticism. If religion be of all others the most important subject, if it be well to love God and do good with "all the heart and soul and strength," we see not why he who enforces its truths should be compelled to repress all his enthusiasm and strangle every hearty conception. Ill would the Sermon on the Mount, and the eloquence of Paul on Mars Hill, have satisfied the delicate taste of these critics. In the power and directness of His style, who "spake as never man spake," in the impetuous rhetoric of the apostle to the Gentiles, the blunt honesty of James, and the enthusiasm of Peter, we recognize models which no man will err to follow. The style of Martineau presents a fine contrast to that of many in his own sect, who seem to fear lest people should make religion a matter of feeling; and we see in him the immeasurable increase of power imparted to an acute intellect by a fervent spirit.

But it was not our intention to speak of our author as a controversialist, or to review certain theological opinions of his which differ widely from the usual belief. We have reserved for ourselves the more agreeable task of viewing him as a writer upon practical religion. We cannot resist the conviction that, however powerfully he may wield the weapons of disputation, yet it is in the application of Christian truth that he excels most writers of the present time. The intimate knowledge of the moral nature, the spiritual perception which discovers the meaning of every form, and the influence of every circumstance upon individual progress, and that glow of devotional and

Digitized by Google

reverential feeling so eminently his, well fit him for discoursing to men upon the duties of life.

The present work, as before mentioned, consists of twenty-two short discourses, written in a style more chaste than the usual manner of the author. Of these, we would mention, as most pleasing to ourselves, "Silence and Meditation," "The Strength of the Lonely," "The Kingdom of God within us," "Christian Peace," and "Great Principles and Small Duties." The book is truly entitled, "Endeavors after the Christian Life." Its tendency is eminently practical, in the highest sense of the term. We never have found, within the compass of three hundred pages, so much to impress the mind with a sense of its duties and destiny, and so much genuine compassion for sin, united with a knowledge of all the workings of the soul in its struggles for goodness.

A few prominent ideas are the foundation of our author's system of religion; the progressive nature of the soul, the obligation to love truth for its own essential beauty, moral responsibility, and the uses of affliction and labor in purifying the spiritual nature. Rarely have we seen these great truths so happily illustrated and enforced. We feel, while reading, that he who writes has indeed a true conception of the pure religion of Christ, and that Christianity only requires such an exhibition of its divine features to the world, to secure its universal adoption.

We remember no author who has the power of expressing so vividly the delicate and transient impulses of our moral nature. Every man has a large class of such feelings, which secretly influence his action in a greater degree, than weightier motives which are more apparent. We have too much charity for our brethren to believe any one sins from the pure love of wickedness. We know, from our own heart, it is not so. Could we look into the souls of men, we should be astonished to perceive the slight causes that determine their actions. Little likes and dislikes, the slightest shades of thought, a moment's dimness of the spiritual vision, which fails to distinguish the delicate point where virtue ends and vice begins — these are the origin of a great portion of our moral actions. A pebble in the bed of a rill upon the summit of the Alleghanies, will determine whether its waters shall fertilize the

Digitized by Google

east or west; so the slightest motive may turn the tide of character, and result in forming the saint or sinner. He who knows not this, by an intimate study of his own heart, can never instruct men in religious duty. It is here that our author displays a power peculiarly his own. He lays bare a human soul for our inspection. We see the adjustment and trembling of the delicate balance in which duty is weighed. We see how it is that men become sinners, and grasp a clue to guide us out from the labyrinth of transgression.

Another of the peculiar excellences of this author, is the sympathetic power he exerts in imparting instruction. To the want of this, must mainly be ascribed the indifferent success of much of the public ministration from the pulpit. Perhaps we cannot better illustrate our meaning than by contrasting the two great methods of popular address.

As far as the reformation of mankind is concerned, all religious instruction may be classed under two distinct forms, which for want of better terms may be styled, the dogmatic and sympathetic. The former prepares itself for its work by a mere knowledge of systematic morality. Its only ideas are, the sinfulness of man, and the requirements of Deity. It addresses men as sinners, and holds up to view the command, "Be ye perfect." It reasons upon the advantages of virtue, proves conclusively that "godliness is great gain," and enforces its conclusions by appeals to hope, interest, and fear. Now it brandishes the terrors of the law, and now assumes the humble posture of entreaty. Now it blesses, and now it curses. It occupies an *elevation apart* from mankind, and utters its instructions with an oracular air. Men hear, and go away unconverted. The instructer, meanwhile, wonders at his ill success. Has he not proved that virtue is the better path? Has he not warned, and entreated, and threatened? He becomes impatient and discouraged. Men are corrupt, he says from his place of authority. His failure must be in the depravity of his hearers. But is it so? Doubtless, in one sense, the ill success of every teacher is the result of disinclination, indifference, or sin in the listener; but may there not be a radical deficiency in the manner of communication? The method, of which we have spoken, rejects

Digitized by Google

the prime element of success. It is ignorant of that with which it deals; it knows nothing of the soul it seeks to save. "It does not succeed in penetrating to the interior wants of our moral nature; it strives, and menaces, and declaims for admission to the heart; it proves its right of entrance, and yet remains without; it does not pass the sacred boundary, and steal into the home-enclosure of the affections."

This method is the legitimate result of Calvinism. If men be totally depraved, more inclined, by nature, to evil than good, and in hourly danger of being precipitated into a miserable eternity, then doubtless all compassion or sympathy for their transgression is a criminal weakness. The only duty of the preacher is to save the soul from the wrath of Jehovah. But the time has come when all religion does not appear to consist in a struggle to escape impending vengeance. Yet, many, who have rejected the creed, yet retain the same idea of instruction. The prevalence of correct theology must, in time, correct a method so opposed to reason, and so ill adapted to the nature of man.

The sympathetic mode is the substitute required. To its full perfection, several elements are necessary. A profound knowledge of the Christian system is indeed indispensable, but this is not the whole. The nature of the being this gospel was given to bless, must be intimately known. By long study of his own heart, must the teacher acquire the ability to minister to the wants of others. He must not only know that men are sinners, but how they became so. The moral nature, in all its varied manifestations must lie open to his view, that he may trace the progress of sin from its first appearance in a yielding to momentary impulse, to its final possession of the whole man. He must be able to indicate before his hearer the very path down which he was forced by his impetuous desires, the rock to which he clung for shelter, the slippery place where he fell, the darkness where he went astray. He must prove that he understands his temptations, pities his tears and his struggles, and sympathizes in his resolutions. He must learn to discover, beneath all the selfishness and sin in the soul of the weak one, the remaining germ of goodness that may be cherished and enlarged,

Digitized by Google

until its neighboring vices shrink away from its presence. And this knowledge must teach him patience, and lead him to recognize, in the feeble convulsive efforts of the transgressor, the beginnings of a nobler life; and prevent him from yielding to despair at his successive failures. This knowledge is not the acquisition of a day; it comes only from a long course of inward observation, and intimate study of human character. Indeed, most men never acquire it until some fearful temptation, or crushing affliction, forces them to know themselves, and summon all their spiritual resources in self-defence.

And then the Christian teacher, that he may use this knowledge aright, must place himself in a condititon to reach the hearts of others; for only by actual contact with all varieties of men, can he do them good. Instead of playing the oracle, he will do well to come down into the dusty thoroughfare of life, and say to his weak brother, "Come with me, and serve God." He must divest himself of all artificial feeling and clerical pomp, content to be a man. The dignity of his station will be far better sustained by the respect men always pay to unassuming goodness, than by pompous airs, and the seclusion of his sacred presence from the vulgar gaze.

Then, when the treasurers of God's word, and the souls of men lie open to his view, and, in the spirit of Him who "sat at meat with publicans and sinners," he moves among his brethren, this one power remains which shall wing his words with flame to the heart of a listening world — that strange sympathetic power, by which we are moved, and without which, though all knowledge be his, he will be a feeble teacher. We cannot explain this influence by which one mind acts upon another, but we know that all mental culture, all profundity of thought, divorced from it, is an useless treasure. It is the power by which genius makes itself to be understood, the strange charm that floats around a combination of few simple words. Thus it is that truth falls dead from the lips of cold intellectual men, and thrills the heart, bursting forth from an earnest and sympathetic spirit. How wonderfully has this been verified in that reformation which has proved a moral resurrection to so many buried in the grave of intemperance. Those homely words, springing from hearts hot with fervor and

Digitized by Google

compassion, those simple details of sin — how strangely have they moved the community. They have been impressed with nature's true mark of genuineness, and therefore have they not failed. This is the power, which, of all others, must qualify the Christian minister. Certain it is, it cannot be separated from that intimate knowledge of the soul, of which we have spoken. It may be that it is not to be acquired, but is one of those marks by which we distinguish the chosen ones of God; yet it becomes every man, who would move others to the love of virtue, to obey the conditions without which it cannot act, and await in hope the coming of the heavenly gift.

We have said that of this latter method our author is a distinguished example. We feel that here is indeed a man who knows us as we know ourselves. The affliction which has stunned us, he can feel and explain; the evil habit which has withered our virtue, he understands. The transient impulse to good, the solemn resolution, and its gradual undermining by the sophistry of temptation, the moral languor which succeeds fresh transgression — he knows them all. We are startled as we read to find pages of our own experience. And then, his words cling to our hearts and force us to acknowledge they are genuine. This power comes not from the wealth of his diction. All the words in the universe may lie before some men, and noble ideas stand ready to assume their choicest garb; and still they would never cause the heart of one being to "burn within him." It is the unconscious faculty, of which we have spoken, that disposes these words, and invests them with a power before which rhetorical splendor is a feeble thing.

We have written in a spirit of warm approbation of our author. Faults there may be in the book before us, but we have not a heart to seek minute defects in that which has done our soul so much good. We forbear making extracts, but entreat every man, whose heart is set on the kingdom of God, to read and consider for himself.

We ask the patience of our readers to a few remarks suggested by the perusal of these discourses. We have spoken of their excellence, where those of most writers are deficient; and it may not be unprofitable to follow the train of thought aroused by such unusual indications of

Digitized by Google

merit. The subject of religious instruction is certainly one of the greatest moment, and he who can in any manner create a feeling which shall relieve the pulpit from the proverbial charge of dulness and inefficiency, will not have labored in vain.

He must be ignorant of the wants of men, who discovers not, at the present time, a wish for a more quickening and spiritual ministration of religious truth. Never has there been a time, we believe, when the community has manifested a greater interest in religion than the present. This interest does not show itself so much in an uncontrollable enthusiasm, as in a discussion of the vital elements of Christianity. The day of forms is past. The vagaries of theologians, and the absurdities proclaimed and acted in the name of religion, have begotten a degree of skepticism which demands a different presentation of religious truth. Pompous airs, an oracular style of instruction, and assumptions of infallibility by the clerical order, have lost their charm, and only draw upon their claimants the righteous rebuke of the community. Men ask for a religion which shall not contradict the first principles of a sound philosophy, or at least shall not trample upon the plainest dictates of common sense. The time is past when momentous doctrines are established in opposition to reason, by a microscopic philology; when quotations from Genesis can prove the trinity, or the penitential hymns of David the doctrine of total depravity, or the scenic representations of Job a diabolical existence. In the application of the Christian morality, also, men ask for conviction rather than cursing, for a knowledge of their own nature and wants, rather than ranting exhortation. We rejoice at this change. No body of men can obtain that unlimited power over the reason and consciences of men which was possessed by the clergy in times past, without abusing it, and involving religion in their own disgrace. It is a good indication when men criticise the productions of their religious instructers, and demand correct logic and spiritual insight, in place of declamation and enthusiasm.

Such being the state of the public mind, it certainly becomes public religious instructers to consider deeply the wants of the community, and their own ability to supply them. We know there are those who make light of all

Digitized by Google

this; who neither consider the deeply-seated desires of their hearers, or their own want of power to reach the hearts of men. We are told that men do not know what is good for them, that their taste is depraved, and therefore their opinions on the subject worthless. Their duty is to listen with becoming reverence to every thing spoken. "It is all preaching, and all very good." But with all deference to the views of such reasoners, we would suggest that the time is past, or rapidly passing, when nonsense from the pulpit will be pronounced "very good." We know that foolish men often produce a strong impression upon the public mind; but we know, also, how transitory must be such impressions. It is not true that a congregation of people, possessed of good native sense, can be a long time deceived by foolishness, however graceful may be the manner of its dispensation. True, they may not be able distinctly to indicate where the precise deficiency lies; but there is a feeling, which cannot be driven out of their minds, that something is wrong. They may not know the exact quality of the spiritual food dispensed to them, but of one thing they are assured, — their souls are faint. And when the idea once begins to arise that they have been deceived, that they have given their tears, their sympathies, and their full approbation to what was undeserving, the revulsion of sentiment is fearfully rapid. A minister must impart the spirit of the gospel, either by his lips or life, to satisfy the most ignorant community for any time of long duration. Men know their own wants, and he who ridicules their expression of them, and conforms not his method to the actual need, must lose his influence as a Christian teacher. It is foolishness to say that the present generation requires no different ministration than the former. The world is not what it once was. A "change has come over the spirit" of communities, and a corresponding change must come over religious instruction. In all this there is no compromise of truth by the preacher. It is a question of method, not a surrender of essential principles. It is thus that the Deity works, adapting the different modes of his communication to different stages of human progress; now the Patriarchal, now the Mosaic, and again the Prophetic and Christian.

Digitized by Google

What then are the religious wants of our times? In what proportions must the preacher enforce doctrine and duty?

Every newly-discovered truth must be established by controversy. Especially is this true of religious opinions, in which a greater number of men are immediately interested, and in which errors are supposed to be so fatal. There is no absurdity so great that it cannot be admitted into the mind under the sanction of a Christian name, and enlist in its support a body of unscrupulous defenders. Hence the necessity, in the first advocates of a new religious opinion, to direct their strength exclusively to its establishment. Their first duty is to prove the title of their doctrine as truth. A proper degree of moderation, and a decent respect to the opinions of others, are all that can reasonably be demanded of them, on the negative side, at this period.

But such a position is temporary. The new opinion once proved, a question, no less important than that of its reception, arises: What is its relation to other religious truths? It is not sufficient to turn it out loose; a particular situation must be assigned it. If the work of the reformer was confined to the demolition of an erroneous system, the demand upon him, now, is to supply one more reasonable. "God has so ordained it, that society will yield nothing, not even the paltriest superstition, to the persuasion of mere disproof." He who leaves the abode of the "unclean spirits" of error "empty, swept, and garnished," must not be surprised to witness the return of the evil one with "seven other spirits more wicked than itself."

Such being the duty of the religious reformer, the old method of controversy must, of course, be laid aside. His first labor is performed, the door of the temple of truth is unbarred for the reception of the claimant, and now must he go in and settle precedence between his own and other lawful occupants. Thus the new work is one not of opposition, but recognition. Before it can be decided what place the new opinion must occupy, the relative importance of others must be discussed and acknowledged. That this is a difficult task, no man can deny, who has observed the rise of new religious sects. Many a body of Christians,

Digitized by Google

who have fought bravely to establish their own peculiar sentiments, falter and become hopelessly bewildered, when the task of construction is laid upon them. But difficult as is the work, it must be done. Men cannot always live on one opinion, however dear or important; and the arm at length becomes wearied by beating down old errors, however monstrous. The duty is imperative, and wo to him who shrinks from it. Where, then, shall he look for the remaining truths of the Christian system?

The religion of Christ is a combination of truths of various degrees of importance. The system is completed only by a harmonious adjustment of all these separate parts. He may be said to be truly indoctrinated, in whose mind all these exist in their proper proportions. There is, however, but one stand-point from which the field of religious truth can be rightly viewed.

Now it would be a most unwarrantable assumption of infallibility, should any sect, at the beginning of its existence, claim for itself this perfectly harmonized conception of the gospel system. All experience teaches that it is not thus that human knowledge is completed. The world is gradually enlightened, by the introduction of new ideas into the old defective belief. The investigations of one great original mind go to enlarge the horizon of discovered truth. The great leaders in science, philosophy, and Christianity, have been men profoundly impressed with a single opinion, to which they have devoted their lives. A Christian sect is, at first, nothing but a gathering of men about one truth. A burning conviction, on this one point, draws them together, overcomes minor differences of sentiment, and urges them onward. Thus we may consider every denomination of Christians as the representative of a certain class of opinions. It would be easy to verify this, by an examination of the various sects existing among us. The exclusive view of the great truths of retribution, the omnipotence and justice of God, is the foundation of all the revolting dogmas of Calvinism. An earnest conception of the moral elements of Christianity, may be considered the distinguishing peculiarity of Unitarianism; while the destiny of man, and the law of love, are the central principles of our own denomination.

Here, then, are the sources from which to obtain the

Digitized by Google

complete system of religious opinion. The first battle of controversy passed, that sect, which honestly seeks for truth, will look about to acknowledge the rightful claims of its neighbors. It will discover the elements of a true religion scattered among different classes of believers, overlaid, perhaps, by many superstitions, but still it is the heart of their life. It will be content, in the true spirit of humility and brotherly love, to divest itself of all undue partiality for its own distinguishing truth, and generously recognize the claims of other systems, free them from their corruptions, and incorporate them into its own. It will be especially careful to ascertain whether its own peculiar truth *is the central point* of Christianity; whether it is, in fact, the eminence from which to view the field of God's providence. To perform this labor faithfully; to yield, if need be, its own partialities; to be content to see an opinion which it fondly prized as the head of all faith, pass into its true position beneath another,—is the highest effort of the understanding, and the noblest exercise of Christian charity.

We need not be informed that few religious denominations are alive to their duty in this respect. Men love those opinions, for which they have struggled through a period of hot controversy, too well to admit any other to their alliance. They fondly believe that the one dear truth comprehends all the Christian system, and go on endeavoring to draw from it their religious existence. But experience has taught us that he who links himself to one idea for life or death, must ultimately fall. God has ordained that he who recognizes not the elements of truth in those around him, shall feel the ground failing beneath his own feet. The great truths of Christianity will claim their social privileges, however much we seek to confine them in separate creeds.

This, then, is the end, the last stage of controversy; to go forth with our own dearly-purchased opinions, and in a noble spirit of recognition embrace all of truth which may lie in the possession of those around us. This it is to love the high interests of God's kingdom better than the narrow interests of a sect. This is true freedom, true Universalism.

But the pulpit has not fully ministered to the wants of the community, when it has performed aright all the duties

Digitized by Google

of controversy. The great work of applying scriptural truth remains. We cannot resist the conviction that an earnest presentation of the great spiritual elements of Christianity, is the most imperative requisition of the age. The time has come, when our faith must be tried by its adaptation to the deepest wants of the soul. The mass of the community are much less interested in sectarian contentions than the theologians who minister to them. What does it suffice, to prove to a man of common sense and generous impulses, that his neighbor's opinion is a "damnable heresy?" He beholds this heresy purifying his character, supporting him in trial, cheering him in the hour of death. We do not deny the value of a reasonable system of doctrine, or the necessity of its proper advocacy from the pulpit; but we say, and the body of intelligent Christians in our congregations say, that the doctrinal is, after all, subservient to the spiritual; that even the most perfect system of opinion is worthless, if it do not nourish that spiritual life which Christ came into the world to establish in the souls of his followers. Men feel that, after the proof of a faith, must come its use; wearied of the talk of the corruptions of religion, they entreat to be presented with its pure and fresh influences. And that this desire is founded in reason, who can doubt? For what is religion? A mere system of opinions about God and duty and destiny? Did Christ come into the world only to enlighten the intellect, while the heart of humanity should remain cold? Is not the great purpose of his coming, to exalt the whole being, at once to purify the mental vision and kindle the religious affections, to hasten the coming of that time when every noble conception of duty shall pass without hindrance into a nobler fruition? And how shall his kingdom come if men feel not in their souls, and act not out in their daily lives, the convictions of their reason? How prone are all to forget that the religion of Christ is a life, and not a mere system. A mental perception of the truth becomes ours, and we stand congratulating ourselves upon the possession of the "pearl of great price," while the passions that inhabit our hearts, and the frailties that every hour separate us from the presence of our Father, are forgotten. The sight of a multitude flocking to our sectarian standard, rejoicing in their de-

Digitized by Google

liverance from prejudice, enraptures our hearts, and makes us believe the great millennium of God has come; but, alas, what errors of opinion enslave men like their own corrupt desires? What are a thousand proselytes, compared to one humble soul filled with penitence, and earnestly longing for a true life? It is well that men believe reasonably, but it is better that they act religiously. The "corruptions of Christianity" are fearful, but the corruptions of God's image are more alarming. When shall we awake to a full appreciation of the truth, that enlightened opinions about the Bible are not religion; that the preparation of the understanding is but the first step in a true life, and worthless when not succeeded by a "preparation of the heart?" Now if this be truth, who can deny that the exertions of the pulpit should be mainly directed to an enforcement and illustration of Christianity as a life; that the element of duty should be made the focus to which all the rays of speculation should concentrate. The great truth of the New Testament is righteousness, progress in a true life; and whoever elevates any doctrine above this, mistakes the character of the gospel he preaches. This is the ultimate result, without which all religious instruction is worthless. For this purpose must the true minister of Christ be thoroughly furnished. The soul of man is his study and his field of exertion. To overcome the obstinacy of sin; to strengthen a crushed spirit; to encourage a heart desponding in view of its many transgressions; to awaken indifference and confirm a half-formed resolution; to manifest a calm and severe disapprobation for all sin, and a Christlike pity and tenderness for every human being in its power; this is the central point to which he will direct his exertions.

Were we disposed, we might illustrate the mournful results ensuing when the pulpit is false to its solemn responsibilities in this respect, and gives to hungering and thirsting men only the husks of controversy. Have we not all seen communities where the zeal for righteousness was changed to zeal for opinion; where men were furious in matters of doctrine, and like dead men in the life of the soul? A long continuance of such ministration to a consenting people, is sure to elevate the combative principle in religion above all else; to petrify the affections, and

Digitized by Google

deepen the impression always too prevalent, that Christianity is a thing to fight about, rather than to be lived. Such a state of the public mind is most discouraging. When men view religion only through the medium of pride of opinion, and go through with all its forms in a spirit only of doctrinal zeal, it is worse even than indifference and stupidity. Upon the ministry is laid the solemn duty of arresting this tendency. We speak our honest conviction, when we say that a body of divines, who lend all their power for inflaming the controversial element in the heart of the community, is the greatest curse upon earth! Better no church and no pulpit, than one which kindles the fires of religious contention, and never refreshes the worn heart of a sinful world!

The great want of the community, then, is "practical preaching;" the application of the Scripture morality; the illustration of Scripture doctrine in its relation to the inner life. But now the questions, no less important than those before discussed, arise, What shall be the method of this application? How is the spiritual life to be most successfully promoted in the hearts of men?

Now there are two methods of ministration, both aiming to make men religious, and yet directly opposed in their mode of operation. The first, and indeed the most common, is the one adopted by the great reform-organizations of the present day. We are not about to condemn these associated efforts to improve society. They are the offspring of a genuine religious benevolence, and one of the noblest indications of the upward tendency of the community. We bless God for the desolate homes and hearts they have cheered, and the wickedness they have reformed. Our present purpose is rather to test the value of this mode of exertion for making men *religious;* to inquire how far it reaches, and whether it is the method best adapted for the labors of the pulpit.

The method is simply this: to attack *particular forms* of sin; to array the whole moral force of the community against one species of transgression, and "hunt it to the death." It aims to purify the man by reforming his habits. It begins at the outposts, and advances toward the heart of the camp. Now it is evident that such a method of operation, if it aim at the entire purification of the world,

Digitized by Google

must be interminable; for the corrupt heart will invent forms of transgression faster than all the pulpits in christendom can "preach them down." The particular sins of the world are innumerable, and the number is constantly increased by new invention. There are forms of transgression peculiar to every grade of society, from hopeless poverty and ignorance up to wealth and the highest refinement. In fact, as every individual changes his mode of life, and is thrown into new circumstances, he is exposed to a new class of temptations. And is it not a hopeless task to attempt to hunt down these innumerable forms of transgression? We may preach out of a man his sin of to-day; but to-morrow it has changed its form, and we must direct our spiritual artillery in another quarter. It places the gospel ministry in the situation of Hercules, and dooms it to an everlasting beating off of heads which are constantly renewed.

But this method is radically deficient in another respect. From its very nature, it can never reach the fount of moral action. Its work is accomplished when the outward manifestation of sin is prevented. But is this the extent of Christianity? May not a man be a consistent member of a temperance, an anti-slavery, a moral-reform, or an odd-fellow's society, and still be far from a religious man? A prudent regard for reputation and worldly prosperity, is sufficient to kindle a burning zeal for all these forms of moral action. We must not forget that it is one thing to be freed from bad habits, and another to be a Christian; and that the formal practice of morality may exist independently of the true spiritual life.

This mode of action, then, is limited. In its direct effects, it can only reduce the outposts of sin. With a correct understanding of its power, it may be judiciously employed; but let us not expect too much from it. The most it can do towards religious culture, is to prepare the mind for the reception of the divine influence. It clears the field of many obstructions; it "roots up the stumps, and rolls away the rocks," but does not sow the seed, and bring forth the harvest.

Religious instruction has a higher aim than all this. The pulpit is not a mere keeper of the peace, an agent of government to make good citizens, or even an institution,

Digitized by Google

to create "*respectable*" men. If it have any mission, it is to make men religious, to implant and nourish the germs of spiritual life. Therefore, if it confine itself to the popular method of which we have spoken, it is faithless to its highest duty. There are times and seasons, doubtless, when the servant of God is bound, in the name of religion, to rebuke public sins and peculiar forms of individual transgression; but his great exertion must be in a different direction, or his labors will only become a tirade against the offences of men. In short, we want *spiritual preaching*.

There are associations connected with this phrase, "spiritual preaching," which must be forgotten. To many it suggests the same idea as the cant term "transcendentalism," another name for visionary speculation and nonsense. It is not in this sense we use the term, but as indicating a mode of pulpit exertion opposite to that we have examined.

We have said that men cannot be made religious by hunting down their particular sins. There is only one method of accomplishing this purpose: Make the heart right, create in the soul a genuine love of duty and God, implant a deep sentiment of responsibility; and all sin will be exterminated. We have no security for any morality which has not its roots in permanent religious conviction. All else is but a pretence, a deference to the opinions of society, or the result of prudent calculation. The world never can be purified by smothering its abuses. "Personal repentance, the transference of the life from conventionalism to conviction, the kindling of pure and productive affections, must precede and usher in the reign of God upon the earth. Men must truly venerate the Deity within them, and he will not be slow to descend with his peace on society around them. The holy and divine must first be recognized and enshrined in the individual and private heart; and then will follow its wider conquests over humanity. *There* is the home and citadel of its strength, from which it sallies forth to win its public triumphs and establish its general rule; *there* the centre whence its influence radiates, till it embraces and penetrates even the outlying margin of barbarism and sin."

If it be true, then, that the kingdom of God can never come but by establishing the religious life in the souls of men, we have at once a clue to guide us in Christian in-

Digitized by Google

struction. That is spiritual preaching which aims to create the spiritual life; which seeks to inspire a love of God and love of man so intense that it will purify the soul of all desire for sin; which nourishes those religious affections that lie at the bottom of every man's heart; which places in the centre of the being an idea of duty, before the gaze of which every evil desire shall shrink; which labors to place conscience on her lawful throne, and subdue the whole man to obedience to its divine oracles. It assails not rudely all the habits and prejudices of the man, but patiently and lovingly continues its humble task of protecting and nourishing the tender blade of godliness, which a rude wind might destroy. And thus the heart warms, and the resolutions strengthen, and one sin and error after another is expelled as it obstructs the growing life, until the soul is regenerated by the peaceful but irresistible operation of inward convictions. Thus wrought the great Teacher. He rebuked few public sins, he wearied not himself to reform the abuses of society; but in the hearts of the devoted few who hung upon the words that came from his lips, he created a love for truth, and a zeal for its propagation, which might glow in their lives, and draw all men after them into the kingdom of heaven.

We have thus, in our imperfect manner, offered a few hints upon religious instruction. If there be any truth in them, they must be peculiarly worthy of our own adoption, as a denomination. The unprecedented increase of our sect forces upon us many considerations of an anxious as well as joyful nature. Never has Providence given to a Christian denomination a nobler mission than ours; to develop the glorious truths of God's love and man's destiny. The success which the advocates of these principles have achieved by honest, zealous, often unlettered effort, against the trained and practised defenders of a worn-out theology, is a high proof of their deep foundation in truth. But with our increasing strength, comes an increasing responsibility. The community requires that a denomination, which promises at no distant day to become the most numerous in the land, shall do something more than continue raining its blows upon the battered sides of Calvinism. Now is the time of our transition from the

Digitized by Google

work of demolition to construction, and it remains to be seen how we bear ourselves under the burden of our new task. In our own section of the country, the period of controversy is passed. A demand comes up for the fruits of this new faith; and how shall it be answered?

Now if our belief be a true faith, we shall not shrink from a demand so reasonable, but proceed, at once, to the work of applying it. If we believe in the obligation and necessity of duty, — the test by which all religious systems must at last be tried, — we shall show, by actual experiment, that our faith is peculiarly fitted to nourish the true life. It may be, as our opponents aver, that in our zeal to promulgate correct views of man's destiny, we have said too little of his responsibility. It was the natural reaction from the most revolting feature of Calvinism. If we mistake not, a conviction is becoming universal among us, that our preaching should be more addressed to men as accountable beings. All experience will assure us, that to teach a love of God which confounds moral distinctions, is pernicious in its results upon individual holiness. In God's word and in God's universe are joined, inseparably joined, the great facts of virtue and happiness. The Scriptures, indeed, announce a final harmony, but always as a consequence of final holiness and reconciliation; and the connection of the two ideas should never be overlooked, in any of their relations. A. D. M.

Art. IV.

An Evening Landscape.

From the German of Matthison.

Golden light
Gilds the height;
On the ruined woodland tower
Falls the soft, enchanting shower.

Still and clear
Shines the mere;
Soft as swans the fish-boats glide
Homeward o'er the sleeping tide.

Digitized by Google

Silver sand
Lines the strand;
Crimson, here, and there more pale,
Cloud-shapes through the water sail.

Rustling low,
In the glow,
Reedy marsh the cape engirds,
Wildly swarmed with ocean-birds.

Through the green,
Dimly seen,
With its garden, vines, and well,
Gleams the mossy hermit's cell.

From the sea,
Peacefully,
Fades the glory of the hour,
Fades the shimmer from the tower.

Full-moon-light
Floods the height;
Ghost-knells in the valley chime
For the vanished hero-time. S. C. E.

Art. V.

The Divine Purpose in the Reconciliation of All.

"Having made known unto us the mystery of his will, according to his good pleasure, which he hath purposed in himself: that, in the dispensation of the fulness of times, he might gather together in one all things, in Christ, both which are in heaven, and which are on earth, even in him." Eph. i. 9, 10.

This passage, which we shall make the theme of our observations, is naturally divided into two parts, by the two general ideas it expresses: First, that God had made known, to the apostle and his brethren, the mystery of his will, according to his good pleasure, which he had purposed in himself. And, secondly, what this mystery of the divine will was, namely, that in the dispensation of the fulness of times, God might gather all things together, in one, even in Jesus Christ, whether they were things in heaven, or things on earth. It can hardly be necessary to say, in explanation of this latter phrase, that to be gathered

Digitized by Google

into Jesus Christ, is to be regenerated, made new creatures in him, and saved in him.

These are the two general ideas which we shall proceed to illustrate. The whole manifestly relates to that most important subject, the will and purpose of God with respect to the salvation of mankind in Jesus Christ. It appears, from the tenor of the New Testament, that it was the will of God that all his creatures should be restored, and brought together into one spiritual fold; not, however, at once, and as it were at the first effort, but gradually, in process of time, within the great period here marked out as the dispensation of the fulness of times. We know it was thousands of years, before God sent Christ even to begin the work on earth. Of course, he did not intend that the world should be saved before *that* time. And even when Christ came, there was much to be prepared, much to be done, before the enterprise could be finished. His kingdom, was, at first, like a grain of mustard-seed, which is the least of all seeds; and it would take ages for it to grow up into a great tree, overshadowing the earth. All this was provided for, in the divine counsel; the necessary conditions were all recognized in the eternal plan, just as they were to be realized in the actual execution.

Why was not the whole world saved at once? Why not put an end to all sin at the beginning, and without so protracted a delay? It might seem better to us, to have had the entire work accomplished, from the very first. But not so, with God. He saw fit to pursue the same course, here, that he does in the kingdom of nature. Nothing comes to maturity, at once; first, there is the seed, then the germ, then the blade above-ground, and after long delay comes the ripe fruit. So, in the plan of salvation through Jesus Christ, it was not the original design that the whole should be completed, and all mankind brought in, till the close of the dispensation of the fulness of times. The will of God, which he had purposed in himself, was, "that, in the dispensation of the fulness of times, he might gather together, in one, all things, even in Christ."

Until this period, the work of human salvation will, of course, be in an unfinished state. It will, indeed, be going on; it has always been going on. In every age, vast numbers have been gathered in, increasing the "general

Digitized by Google

assembly and church of the First-born." And in every future stage of the gospel-day, countless additions will continue to be made to the multitudinous hosts of the Captain of our salvation. But up to the very close of the great warfare he is waging against sin, there will likewise be numbers who are not reclaimed from their rebellion. Till that period, sin will abound. But, then, it will eventually be discovered, that wherever sin had abounded, grace was all the time much more abounding, and preparing the way for its final triumph. When the dispensation of the fulness of times closes, the victory will be universal and complete. The very last wanderer shall have been gathered in; one spirit of life and blessedness, perfect and eternal, shall fill the wide creation, for God shall "be all in all." Such is the result that God "hath purposed in himself," — determined within his own omnipotent resources.

And he made this purpose known to the apostle and his brethren: "Having made known unto us the mystery of his will," &c. There are some things in this suggestion, which we wish to bring out into distinct view. St. Paul here gives us to understand that this will, or purpose, of God to gather all things ultimately into Christ, was not properly made known till the apostle's time. It had been a mystery, hitherto, a truth not clearly understood, wrapt in obscurity; but, now, says St. Paul, he hath "made it known unto us." What we wish to observe, particularly, on this, is, that we are not to infer that there never had been, till then, any disclosure whatsoever of this grand design of God to save the world. It had long been partially disclosed. We may illustrate the case, by observing that we say, in general language, that the gospel itself was not made known, till the coming of Christ; and yet we know that it had been partially, indistinctly, revealed, ages before, to the patriarchs and prophets. And the same may be said of this great truth, the purpose of God to save all mankind. Indeed the gospel was never announced by Heaven, either obscurely or plainly, without including this as the final result. Never did ancient prophecy foreshadow the kingdom of Christ, howsoever dimly, without bringing into a corresponding degree of light, its ultimate universality. Just so far as the gospel has, at any time, been disclosed, this has always been recognized in some form,

Digitized by Google

answering to the clearness with which the general subject was exhibited. During the whole course of the Old Testament dispensation, it was declared, from time to time, that all the world was included in the blessings of the divine economy. But, then, it was not so clearly announced, in those times, as to make it commonly understood, — any more than the gospel itself was then commonly understood. The ancient prophets cast some light on the eventual destination of the human race, as well as on other subjects belonging to the future dispensation. But it was like light shining in a dark place; the darkness comprehended it not. To use St. Paul's language, God had preached, beforehand, the gospel to Abraham and the patriarchs, in those exceedingly great and precious promises, so often referred to, in after times; I mean, his promises to Abraham, Isaac and Jacob, that in them, and in their seed, which was Jesus Christ, all the nations, and families, and kindreds of the earth should be blessed. *There* was a faint discovery of this great truth. And this, says St. Paul, was the gospel preached beforehand to Abraham. It was not partial; it was very different from the exclusiveness of Judaism; it was universal, and was a foreshadowing of the better covenant. We scarcely need add, that the chain of promises, of a similar purport, runs on through all the Old Testament. Here and there we find them opening to view, in the Psalms, in the prophets, and especially in Isaiah, like so many light-houses glimmering through the night on thousands of miles of coast. "All the ends of the world shall remember, and turn unto the Lord," says David; "all the kindreds of the nations shall come and worship before thee." This was not Judaism; it was an idea of vastly wider reach. "All the nations which thou hast made, shall come and worship before thee, O Lord, and shall glorify thy name." Says the great evangelical prophet, Isaiah, "In this mountain shall the Lord of hosts make unto all people a feast of fat things . . . . . And he will destroy, in this mountain, the face of the covering cast over all people, and the veil that is spread over all nations. He will swallow up death in victory. And the Lord God shall wipe away tears from off of all faces; and the rebuke of his people will he take away from off all the earth; for the Lord hath spoken it." Again: "Look

Digitized by Google

unto me, and be ye saved, all the ends of the earth; for I am God, and there is none else. I have sworn by myself; the word hath gone out of my mouth, and shall not return, that unto me every knee shall bow and every tongue shall swear, surely shall say, In the Lord have I righteousness and strength." When Isaiah prophesied of Christ, and foretold that he would be a man of sorrows and acquainted with grief, bruised for our transgressions, and bearing the iniquities of us all, he closed the sad prediction of his sufferings, with this note of triumph, "He shall see of the travail of his soul, and be satisfied." He of Calvary, who gave himself a ransom for all, shall yet see what his soul travailed for. None of his sufferings shall prove in vain; none of the objects he had in view in tasting death for every man shall fail. "He shall be satisfied;" the result, sure and universal, shall answer the utmost reach of his desire.

Such are some of the disclosures that had been made of God's purpose, during the Old Testament dispensation. If it should now be asked, How, then, was it a mystery, till the time of the gospel, if it had thus been spoken of, before? Why does St. Paul say, it had been made known to them, — just revealed — if it had been so long known already? The answer is, that few had understood it; few had understood those previous announcements of the gospel itself, — perhaps none except the prophets, even if they fully comprehended the extent of the truth they uttered. Those former revelations were like single bursts of light on the darkness of midnight; as we have sometimes seen, in the nightly heavens, flashes of lightning that pierced down deep into the solid gloom, displaying, for a moment, the whole prospect of forest, mountain, river and plain, all around to the horizon, and then swallowed up again by the returning darkness.

Let us, however, take our leave of the Old Testament dispensation. Let us pass to the New. In the coming of Christ, the purpose of God to save all mankind, was revealed with a clearness and a fulness, with which it had never been revealed before; like the clear, broad, steady day succeeding the fitful flashes of the midnight storm. The whole scheme of salvation, as it is presented to us in the coming of our Saviour, is itself an everlasting demon-

Digitized by Google

stration of the purpose of God to gather all things together into Jesus Christ. The very gift of a Saviour to the world, was enough to give the apostles assurance of the eternal purpose that lay behind. It showed what was intended, what was undertaken. Let us ask attention to the following inquiry: Why did Christ come into the world? on what errand? What did the Father send him for? God had some purpose in his mission; what was it? St. John has condensed the answer that lies out on the face of the whole New Testament, into this short sentence: "We have seen, and do testify, that the Father sent the Son to be the Saviour of the world." *That* was the will, *that* the design, which existed beforehand in Deity; which lay back behind the mission of Christ; and which was the cause of his being sent into the world. The act of sending him, was only the open expression of that design, its actual development in its process towards final execution; for nobody can suppose that Christ was sent to do what God had not already intended should thus be done. On this point, we are not obliged to resort to particular texts, and to accumulate passage on passage, for proof. Sweep them all away from the page of inspiration, if we please, or, which amounts to the same thing, misinterpret them as we may; still, here stands the one great central fact of Christ's mission; and that fact speaks out more decisively than any mere language in the world can speak, and tells the whole story of God's design.

When we hear people doubting, and inquiring, and cavilling, and disputing whether it is the pleasure of God which he hath purposed in himself, to save all mankind, we cannot but wonder that they do not ask themselves this one question: What did he send his Son into the world for? The answer to that, is the answer to the whole, and leaves no room for any after plea. If God sent him to save only a certain part of our race, then we know it was his purpose to save that part; if he sent him to give himself a ransom for all, and to taste death for every man, then we just as certainly know it was his purpose that all should ultimately be saved, — and that it was no passive, indifferent purpose, (pardon the misnomer!) but one that he acted upon with all the earnestness he put forth in the plan of redemption. We want no further proof; the fact speaks for itself.

Digitized by Google

And it is worthy of remark, that this is the light in which the apostle regarded the matter. It was this fact which made the mystery of God's will known to him and his brethren. For St. Paul illustrates the whole case on this ground, in his Epistle to Timothy. "I exhort, therefore," says he, "that prayers, and intercessions, and giving of thanks be made for all men . . . . . For this is good and acceptable in the sight of God our Saviour, who will have all men to be saved, and come unto the knowledge of the truth. For there is one God, and one Mediator between God and men, the man Christ Jesus, who gave himself a ransom for all to be testified in due time." How did St. Paul know that God would have all men to be saved, and come unto the knowledge of the truth? How was this made known to him? He informs us, in the next words: "For, there is one God, and one Mediator between God and men, the man Christ Jesus, who gave himself a ransom for all." *That* was the fact, which showed the apostle, at once, what the will of God was. The only Mediator whom the Almighty had constituted between himself and men, was given as a ransom for all. Such was the universal extent which was actually occupied, in the beginning of the work; marking out the length and breadth of the plan which was to be executed,—just as when we see a house-builder mark out his ground and lay the foundation, we know at once the extent of the edifice which he has in his mind, and which he means to erect. Look to Jesus, to him crucified for all; there we see God's eternal counsel brought out into open view, and demonstrated in actions, more expressive than words. Our understandings may become perplexed by false arguments and prejudices; but one glance at that cross on which the Son of God tasted death for every man, puts all doubts to flight. For ourselves, we must give up our faith in Jesus Christ crucified for all, or receive the testimony which is written by God's own hand upon the cross, that he will have all men to be saved, and to come unto the knowledge of the truth. *There* it is that we see this truth engraved in other characters than human: It is the mystery of God's will, according to his good pleasure which he hath purposed in himself, that in the dispensation of the fulness of times, he might gather all things into Christ. "For it pleased the Father that in

Digitized by Google

him should all fulness dwell; and having made peace through the blood of his cross, by him to reconcile all things unto himself; by him, whether they be things in earth, or things in heaven."

To us, at least, the truth of the ultimate salvation of all, is of unspeakable importance in every respect, both theoretical and practical; is indispensable to a clear understanding of Christianity, and equally indispensable to the unobstructed operation of its spirit in our hearts. It is absolutely necessary to a consistent knowledge of God's character, as immutable love. For, notwithstanding all the light that has been shed, or alleged to have been shed, on the Divine Benevolence in the endless damnation of mankind, the fact is that the human conscience will never recognize any difference between a benevolent God who torments his creatures to all eternity, and a malignant one who does the same. How long will it take theologians to learn that it is actions, and not mere adjectives, which speak home to men's hearts! Call it, if we please, the work of goodness to create beings who are to be losers by their existence, who are to be miserable forever; teach us to say, in all fear, that such a procedure is infinitely good and holy; who does not know that the epithets are mere words of deference, and that the reality alone is recognized in our minds, and produces whatever impression is made there! It is impossible to appreciate the deep import of our Saviour's life and mission, but by their actual bearings on human welfare, and by the end in which the whole is to result. We cannot apprehend the spirit of the Divine Government, in time or in eternity,—we cannot arrive at its principles and aims, but by what it does, not by what it is called. Reject the truth that God will have all men to be saved, and, we do not say that you entirely destroy Christianity, but you rob it of half its glory and power. God would, then, be to us no longer the character in which he is revealed. Jesus Christ, the same yesterday, to-day, and forever, would no longer be as he once was, the friend of sinners, the meek, enduring, devoted lover of man. And eternity itself would cease to be the world of love and joy. Extinguish the hope of universal salvation, and a dark eclipse would cast its portentous shade across all heaven, and earth too.

Digitized by Google

We believe this doctrine is equally necessary to the free development of the life of God in the soul. The spirit of the gospel is love; and this is the character of its doctrines. But if we change its doctrines of universal benevolence, into partiality and endless wo, we shall find that in spite of all precautions, we have changed its spirit also. The command to love our neighbor as ourselves may indeed be left standing on the printed page; men may strive to obey it, by the dead letter; but it will no longer breathe forth from the very nature of God, and of Jesus Christ, and of the Divine Government,—from every thing that is divine,—as it does under the system of universal grace. God is love, Jesus Christ is love, all heaven is love; and the means that God has employed, in the gospel, for the salvation of mankind, is the manifestation of this love. "God was in Christ, reconciling the world unto himself." "God so loved the world, that he gave his only begotten Son."

It is becoming now, more generally understood and felt, that our last hope for the regeneration of the world, lies in the omnipotent power of love over the human heart, and in its efficiency to reach every possible case, the more desperate as well as the less aggravated. Men are beginning to learn, what we so long contended for apparently in vain, that there is none beyond the reach of kindness. They are stretching out their hands to the ruined and utterly lost, and calling to them, in life-giving tones, like those which shall awaken the dead, "Brethren, be of good cheer; we have hope, unfaltering hope, for you yet!" What wonders of reform, what astounding miracles in the moral world, has this spirit wrought, within the few past years! thus demonstrating, beyond all former belief, the practical energy of the principles we maintain. Whence came this new development, but from that increasing faith in boundless love and unfailing mercy, which is working silently, like leaven, through the whole mass of society! This spirit is speaking into all our dungeons and prisons, breathing hope and peace on the darkened soul of the culprit, relieving his wretchedness, and giving him that most precious, most longed-for, of all earthly boons, sympathy. Its voice is beginning to be heard in our halls of legislation, awakening a new impulse, there, to the cause of humanity and

Digitized by Google

justice, and bidding those who make our laws, to abolish every revengeful and cruel penalty. It is speaking through all the nations of Christendom, and even beyond. The captive is losing his chains, from the dens of Tripoli to the snows of the Arctic Circle, and from the islands that gem the Northern Atlantic to the stormy cape of South America. What tones are these that are heard on our own shores, like the sound of "ocean-waves ere winds arise," and that are proclaiming, above all the clamor of reckless selfishness and party-chicanery, that the bondman shall at last go free, from our own beloved country! God speed this message of love and mercy through the world. God make us faithful, not only to act out the spirit of this message, but also to spread abroad the truth from which it springs.

We often speak of the consolations of the gospel; but to give them their full effect, they must be those of universal salvation. We need, we imperatively need, assurance that it will be well, hereafter, with our families as well as with ourselves; with our friends, our acquaintances, even with our enemies, if we are Christians, and with all mankind. We cannot stop short of this. We are so made, that there can be no perfect heaven for one, unless it be for all. The whole human family is so connected, woven together as it were, in every direction, by the ties of consanguinity, the bonds of friendship, the cords of love, — and underneath all, a universal net-work of sympathy, — that you cannot pluck away a single member, without tearing the web asunder. Select your victim; take even but one, though at the farthest pole; doom him to endless torment; and there is his father, there is the mother who bore him, there is his family, there his friends, all who sympathize with him. These you have also made wretched; and their wretchedness, again, affects other connections, in ever-widening circles, running out abroad farther and farther. The thunderbolt that shivers one link, never spends its force till it has passed through the whole chain. We are constituted social creatures, bound together by an all-pervading sympathy; and so strong is this connection, strengthened and confirmed in so many ways by living filaments, that it must lift the whole race to heaven, or drag it down to hell. Whatever be its final destiny, it must be shared by

Digitized by Google

the whole together. It is one living body; and it would be death to sunder it. Strike the dividing blow where you please, you cut to the quick, and blood follows the knife. "Whether one member suffer, all the other members suffer with it; or one member be honored, all the members rejoice with it. For the body is not one member, but many." H. B.[2d.]

Art. VI.

Non-Resistance.

The True Grandeur of Nations: an Oration delivered before the Authorities of the City of Boston, July 4th, 1845. By Charles Sumner.

Peace — not War: a Sermon preached in the Federal Street Meeting-House, Dec. 14th, 1845. By Ezra S. Gannett.

Peace, the Demand of Christianity: a Sermon preached in the South Congregational Church, Dec. 28th, 1845. By F. D. Huntington.

It has long been the custom of our city authorities, to celebrate our national independence by appropriate public exercises. In their celebrations, they have aimed to exclude as far as possible all party politics, and render them occasions of true rejoicing to all the friends of freedom. At the last celebration, the oration was given by Mr. Sumner; and though it was by no means remarkable for originality of thought, it produced unusual excitement. Had it been delivered before a Peace Convention, it would have received no special attention. But it was a new thing for the city authorities to be told on the fourth of July, that our nation has no right to use physical resistance in the defence of the lives and liberty of its people; and that our revolutionary fathers secured their independence by a violation of the fundamental principles of Christianity. They knew that there were theorists who held such opinions; but they did not suspect that their orator was one of that class. They heard him however with patience, and extended to him the usual courtesy of soliciting a copy of his oration for the press. And we are glad they did so; for though we dissent from its leading doctrine, we heartily respond to many of its sentiments, and believe that it will

Digitized by Google

do much to show the folly and sin of war, and hasten the time when peace shall be universal. It is, on many accounts, one of the most valuable orations we ever read. It is well written, and contains a vast amount of statistical information of great importance.

The sermons by Messrs. Gannett and Huntington, were called forth by the debates in Congress on the Oregon question, and were, no doubt, designed as a rebuke of the war-spirit which has been manifested in those debates. They are both manly productions, and give a very clear exhibition of the peaceful genius of Christianity. As such they are valuable. Men cannot be too frequently told that Christianity demands peace, not war. The sermons, however, are thoroughly non-resistant. This we regret, for we have no faith whatever in that theory. We regard it as one of the chief errors of our times. But it must be confessed that it is daily gaining adherents, both in this country and in Europe. It is important, therefore, that it should be carefully examined; for if correct, we not only subject ourselves annually to millions of dollars of needless expense, but we employ those millions in rendering men the enemies of God and of each other! We ask, then, *Is it true? Is it practicable? Can order and human rights be maintained without the aid of physical force?*

There is no fact more evident than that most of the aggressions upon human rights, have their origin in the unsanctified desires of the heart. An apostle says, "Wars and fighting come from the lusts. We lust, and have not; we kill and desire to have, and cannot obtain; we fight and war, yet we have not because we ask not." If all men were purified, and led by the gospel, they would respect each other's rights, and do as they would be done by. But sin holds its sway over a large proportion of the world. There is no nation where its accursed power is not widely felt, and where those under its dominion are not constantly engaged in warring against all that is wise and good. Defrauding, stealing, robbing and murdering, are the employment of many. But few fully obey the laws of Christianity. Revenge often arrays man against man; an unholy love of power controls a vast majority of the race, and an all-grasping avarice leads them to deceive, oppress, and wrong each other. The whole history of the world, cor-

Digitized by Google

roborates these views. If we go back to the years before the flood, we find that, because all flesh had corrupted their ways, *the earth was filled with violence.* The strong preyed upon the weak, plundered cities, desolated towns, demolished temples and palaces, and carried destitution wherever they went. All men have been aggressors in proportion as they have yielded to the dominion of sinful passions. Hence the terrible cruelties and wars of all savage nations. Sin and war have ever gone hand in hand; and as they have marched over the world, and down through successive centuries, nations have been convulsed and destroyed. The mind sickens as it contemplates the wrongs they have inflicted, the sufferings they have caused, and the millions on millions they have driven from the earth. No one can look at the statistics of war, without being filled with horror! They show the terrible character of unbridled passions. Some, I know, speak of man as though he were a god; but history shows him, when degraded by sin, to be quite as much of a devil. He has, I grant, great and good powers, and is capable by culture of rising to high excellency and dignity of character; but if he has no moral culture, if he listens only to the teachings of sin, there is nothing too bad for him to do! While then, I reject as utterly false the degrading idea that man is totally depraved, I believe that if his moral nature is neglected, and that if he is constantly subjected to unholy influences, he is capable of becoming as fiery and brutal as any ferocious beast of the forest! It is in this corrupted nature that aggressions have their origin.

Such is the character of the great mass of mankind. Society being composed of persons thus depraved, it is impossible to have the rights of each citizen respected, without laws to define and protect those rights. A government may be pronounced an evil, but if it be an evil, it is a necessary one. Consider how various and numerous are our rights. We have a right to think, and speak, and act for ourselves; we have a right to control property, which we own; we have a right to a fair trial for charges preferred against us; we have a right to govern our own family; we have a right to pursue any honorable calling which is agreeable to our taste or conducive to our interest. These are inalienable rights. But it is by government

Digitized by Google

that they are secured to us. Abolish government, and the powerful would have every thing their way. Though the rights of all might be clearly defined, there would be nothing to secure their protection. There would be no arbiter to whom our differences could be submitted, and no mutual defender from each other's wrongs. We might be perpetually harming each other, interfering with each other, and be daily guilty of brutal violence; but there would be none to bid us, with the voice of authority, to cease from our unholy work; there would be none to say to unbridled passions, "Thus far shall ye go, and no farther."

It is not enough, then, to have wise and good laws. There must be a physical force sufficient to restrain those by whom they are disregarded. Without such a force, laws have only an advisory character, and have no power to secure to society its rights. I do not say that mere physical force is all that is requisite. Education is also requisite. Without this, people are incapable of understanding their laws, and of perceiving their intimate connection with a their interests. Besides, education tends to elevate the mind, and to give it high conceptions of human rights and obligation. According to the criminal-reports of all countries, but a small proportion of convicts have enjoyed the advantages of education. Religion is also requisite to give efficacy to laws. No laws, however wise and good, can be enforced, if in advance of the moral sentiments of the mass of the people to whom they are given. You may arm them with all the checks upon transgression that can be devised, but the moral power requisite to enforce them has no existence, and in consequence they are a dead letter. Enact, for instance, a law prohibiting the sale of intoxicating drinks; but unless temperance has prepared the people to put down such a traffic, the law will be wholly ineffectual. Give a law against theft to a community of thieves, and it will avail nothing. Far back, then, of all laws and police officers and courts of justice, lies the power which renders good laws efficacious. That power is religion. As far as this sways the people, good laws will be efficient, and no farther. This must control them in the use of the power for the enforcement of the laws. But neither education nor religion is enough. Unless the lovers of order and right have a physical force at their command, suffi-

Digitized by Google

cient to restrain the aggressors, the best laws can give no security to life, liberty, or property. A government, then, without physical force, would be no government. Under it, the lawless could commit any depredation they pleased. They could burn dwellings and lay waste cities; and none could say to them, *Villains! cease from this unholy work!* An infuriated mob of a hundred men could destroy an entire nation!

A physical force, therefore, of some kind is indispensable. It is the bulwark of freedom, behind which we rest in security, pursue unmolested our honest callings, and gather in safety around our chosen altars. I will not stop to argue what that force should be, though I am frank to own, that I am unable to devise any which would be better than what we now have. I am not insensible of its immense cost. And when I consider this, I am ashamed of human nature — ashamed that man should have to arm himself against his brother, and that one nation should have to arm itself against another. But the cost of such a force does not prove its inutility. If men are unprincipled, there must be an arm to restrain and punish them. Our rights and lives and treasures, are too precious to be abandoned to the mercy of those who neither fear God nor love equity. We hope it will not be always thus; but while so many of our race continue to be revengeful, treacherous and avaricious, we must cling to physical force as the rear-guard of freedom and right; we must keep on our armor however painful it may be; we must keep our coasts fortified, however revolting to our feelings may be the engine of death. Thus protected, we may preach peace and love, till the dearest hopes of philanthrophists are realized in the regeneration of the world.

The foregoing considerations receive no attention, either in the oration or in the sermons! Mr. Sumner has a long course of reasoning, which he endeavors to support by numerous quotations, to show the terrible character of war, its awful consequences, and its inefficiency in securing the object at which it aims. But nothing advanced on these topics, weakens, in the least, the arguments by which the necessity of physical force is proved. Because man has reason, does it follow that he must use no physical power for his defence, when assailed by one in whom

Digitized by Google

reason is in subjection to the brute? Because war wastes life and property, and degrades men, does it follow that a nation must tamely submit to be mowed down like the grass of the field? He seems to forget that there would be a waste of blood, if a nation did not resist when attacked. To submit is not to save life and liberty. The question is not, — *Shall we have blood or no blood?* If it were, the decision could be given without a moment's hesitancy. But the question is, — Shall we defend ourselves against the lawless, or resign all to their control? Shall we abandon the powers which have hitherto been our protection, and say to the unprincipled, "Go on with your work of ruin"; or shall we still cling to those powers, that order and security may be our portion? All we know of man's unsanctified passions, shows that the ambitious and selfish and licentious would set no bounds to their desires, if they could gratify them without restraint. What then, if our means of defence cost all that Mr. Sumner says, it is no proof against their necessity. What if the ship Ohio costs $175,000 per annum more than the annual expenditures of Harvard University? It is no argument against the necessity of such a ship; for if we could not have the university without an overawing physical force, the money appropriated for the support of the Ohio, may be wisely appropriated.

The reasoning of Mr. Sumner is equally defective in that part of his oration, where he treats of the influences and prejudices which keep alive what he terms the delusion of war. What if justice is not always obtained by war? Does that prove that national defence is wrong? Justice is not always obtained in courts of judicature; but would he have them abolished? What if the wrong practices of nations do not transmute wrong into right? Does that show that we have no right to defend ourselves by a resort to physical force? What if the New Testament says, we must conquer by love? Does that prove that we must tamely submit to all kinds of oppression and cruelties? What if some fight for honor? Is that any proof that we must not defend our lives and liberty?

The sermons fall far short of meeting the real question in debate. They dwell at length upon those precepts which require love to enemies, and prohibit the resist-

Digitized by Google

ance to evil, and from these infer, that all self-defence is wrong. But they make no attempt to show how it would be possible to secure the rights of society, without the aid of physical force. So much stress is laid upon the precepts of the gospel, that it may be well to consider their bearing on the question we are discussing. We have great veneration for the Bible, and believe that its precepts are divine. If, however, they are divine, they cannot be impracticable; and consequently, they should receive no interpretation which would make them destroy the true interests of society. If literally interpreted, the precept which says, — *Resist not evil*, prohibits the moral as well as the physical resistance of evil. Such an interpretation all would say is forced; but is it more so, than that which would make it prohibit all physical resistance of evil? Can it mean that I am not to hold back the assassin who would murder my children? or the incendiary who would burn my dwelling? or the man who casts about firebrands, arrows and death? It is impious to say that one who loved right and justice as the Master did, ever gave a precept containing such prohibitions. The truth is, the precept in question, was never designed for a general rule; but was given to his early followers, as their guide, when wronged by the tyrants under whom they lived. To resist them, would be of no avail; it was better, therefore, patiently to endure.

The command to render *not evil for evil*, prohibits not self-defence, but retaliation. The difference between the two is very great. Retaliation seeks only the injury of him against whom it is aimed; every word it utters, and every blow it strikes, is for injury. It measures the injury it would inflict, not by any rule of justice, but by its own reckless vindictiveness. Self-defence does nothing for the sake of injury. It has no desire to harm the aggressor, and would gladly be spared the necessity which forces it to act. In view of this difference between retaliation and self-defence, it must be confessed, that those who confound them, show a sad want of mental acuteness.

The precepts requiring love to enemies and forgiveness of wrongs, are far from prohibiting self-defence. God loves his enemies, yet he punishes them. He forgives transgressors, yet he makes them feel the weight of his dis-

Digitized by Google

pleasure. In all his dealings, he is governed by love, yet very many and terrible are the judgments with which he visits those who disregard his laws. These facts show that men may feel compelled to inflict evil upon a brother man, and yet have no hatred towards him, and no unwillingness to extend the hand of forgiveness to him. The judge who dooms a criminal to imprisonment, does not hate him or rejoice in his punishment; but knowing him to be a dangerous man, and that crime must be restrained, he feels compelled by the best feelings of his heart, to deprive him of his liberty. We owe duties, not only to criminals, but also to friends. If I see a friend unjustly assailed by the tongue of slander, it is my duty to expose that injustice. If I see a friend wronged out of his possessions, it is my duty to seek their restoration. If I see a friend brutally assailed by ruffians, it is my duty to aid him in protecting himself. That these are duties, cannot be questioned. They spring from our relations to each other, and are enforced by the express commands of God. But one duty can never conflict with another. Hence in driving back the ruthless assassin, I do not violate the law of love or of forgiveness. Every man owes a duty to himself. He is bound to exercise the reason God has given him, and to use aright all the powers with which he is endowed. Strictly speaking, his powers are God's; and he has no right to use them differently than God directs. Has he, then, a right to sacrifice them, or stand still and permit others to do it? If not, he is far from violating the law of love and forgiveness, when he feels compelled to smite him who would destroy his life. The question, I know, is often asked, whether it is loving a man, to maim or destroy him? But is not the same question applicable to God, who maims and destroys? May I not ask, whether the father would exhibit a true love for his children, who should, without any resistance, see them murdered in his presence? Love is not a narrow principle which cries perpetually, — *Harm not the assassin; raise not a hand against the reckless;* it recognizes the rights of the innocent as well as the rights of the wicked; and it will do nothing inconsistent with equity, to shield any from the doom they have incurred. He, then, is false to love, who will not seek to defend the innocent, rather than

Digitized by Google

he who prevents their being trampled upon with the iron heel of cruelty.

In the life of the Saviour, there is nothing which conflicts with this reasoning. He, I grant, never resisted evil. We can, however, base no argument on this; for had he resisted, it would have been in vain. He might, it is true, have employed his miraculous power; but it was given for no such purposes, and such a use of it would have prevented his being an example of patience and submission to those doomed to endure insults and wrongs. But while he did not resist evil, he paid tribute to the government; he said, "Render to Cæsar the things that are Cæsar's;" and he often pointed the rebellious Jews to the destruction which awaited them by the hands of the Romans, as a punishment for their sins. I can see nothing, therefore, in the life of Christ which forbids self-defence. If there is any thing, he reflects but imperfectly the character of the infinite Father who destroyed the Jews for oppressing the Christians. Why did he not let them conquer their enemies by love? and why did he so often point to that destruction, to encourage the Christians in their heavy trials? Why did he not say, — No judgment can be executed for your relief; you must work your way through all difficulties by love?

I shall not be understood, I trust, by the foregoing views, to hold, that man can do wrong for the sake of saving his life or the lives of his friends. I readily admit that he should do right, let what extremity may happen. He would better yield his life than tell a falsehood or violate any moral principle. And I cannot see that one of the positions for which I have contended, conflicts in the least with this idea. In order to show that such is the case, suppose I am attacked in my own dwelling by a man who has announced that he will murder me and my family. Thus attacked, my position would be entirely different from that of my assailant. He would be the aggressor, and be moved by unholy passions. In order to save my own life and the lives of my family, I smite him down. I do not wish to do it; I would be glad to spare him; but my life, and the lives of those about me were entrusted to my care, and I am bound to defend them. Hence the blow which I strike, is entirely different in its character, from that

Digitized by Google

which my assailant strikes. I ask careful attention to this; for if a change of circumstances cannot change the character of an act, self-defence is wrong. But there *is* a wide difference in the two cases. The ruffian wishes to injure the one he attacks; but the man who resists him, does not *wish* to injure the ruffian; he only wishes to defend himself, and he does nothing more than he feels to be essential for that purpose. He is not, like the ruffian, actuated by revenge, hatred, avarice, or any bad passion whatever; he does only what necessity compels him to do.

As this distinction is one of peculiar importance, I will introduce another illustration. Suppose five hundred citizens of Boston, become intoxicated with passion, and, in their madness and revenge, arm themselves with deadly weapons, and commence slaughtering our peaceable citizens, laying waste our dwellings, and reducing our city to ashes! The authorities go out to them and beg them to desist; but they, too, are attacked! Finding that entreaty will not avail, the militia are marched out; and as they stand ready to fire, the insurgents are asked to lay down their arms; but they answer the request by the discharge of their own musketry, and the cry of, — *Destruction! destruction to the reigning powers!* Now, would it be wrong to resist by force such a band of outlaws; wrong to fire upon them, and if needs be, cut them down?

There is a choice of evils here. Either this mob must be allowed to slaughter to their heart's content, or they must be stopped by having the work of slaughter begun among them. The authorities do not wish the destruction of the mob; they would not injure them if necessity did not compel it; but they are bound not to see the innocent fall by the hands of the guilty; not to see rights invaded without resisting the invaders. Thus, we perceive, there may be a conflict, and one party engaged therein may be innocent. If I act in self-defence, I am innocent, even though I find it necessary to destroy; and the city which acts in self-defence, may be innocent, though it destroys.

If right in these views, why may there not be war, and yet, one party in the war be entirely innocent? We will suppose that Mexico, without cause, were to make war upon us. It is a small nation, and possessed of very lim-

Digitized by Google

ited resources; yet, if we were to make no resistance, it could soon do us an incalculable amount of mischief; it could destroy our cities and towns, butcher our citizens, and establish its dominion over our whole land. Now, why would it be any more wrong for this nation to resist Mexico, than for Boston to resist a mob, or for me to resist a ruffian? The war itself would be wrong, yet we should be an innocent party in it. The whole matter is reduced to the single question of self-defence. If we have a right to defend ourselves, a nation must have the same right. If one man has a right to defend himself, two men must have a right to defend themselves; twenty men must have the same right; and a hundred thousand the same. I cannot see what effect numbers can have in regard to this right. And yet, strange as it may seem, some who admit the right of self-defence, deny the right of a nation to defend itself.*

I cannot understand the philosophy by which such a distinction is made. I know it is argued by Mr. Sumner, and justly argued, that a trial of strength between two nations, does nothing towards proving which is right. Neither does the trial of strength between two men, do any thing towards proving which is right. The ruffian who should attack me in my own house, might prove the stronger, and prevail against me, notwithstanding all the efforts I could make in my own defence. The mob might prove more powerful than the authorities they resist, and subdue all the forces brought against them. But because this might be the case, would it be a reason why I should not seek to defend myself, or why duly-constituted authorities should not seek their defence? It is a perfect fallacy, therefore, to say, a nation has no right to defend itself against the aggressions of a foreign foe, though an individual has a right to defend himself against a ruffian, and a city or a town to defend itself against a mob. The principle which justifies self-defence in any case, will justify it in all cases, where violence is recklessly employed in invading rights.

"Force," it is said, by Mr. Sumner, "may be employed under the sanction of justice in the conservation of the

* See Rev. A. P. Peabody's Address on the Nature and Influence of War, in which he admits the right of individuals to defend themselves, but denies the right of a nation to defend itself.

Digitized by Google

laws and of domestic quiet." And well does he say this; for as we have seen, a law which has no physical arm to enforce its demands, has no power to preserve order, restrain outrages, or protect human rights. But here the question urges itself upon us,— Why may not a nation protect itself from foreign aggressions, as well as domestic aggressions? Is it replied, that a court of justice first decides what shall be the punishment for a domestic aggression; and that the force employed against the aggressors only executes what the constituted tribunal has declared just? Then, I ask, Is a court higher than a nation, and better qualified to judge what is right? To me, it seems, that in a mere matter of right, as much confidence could be placed in the decisions of congress, as in the decisions of the highest court in the land. Hence, I can see nothing which can justify the use of force in resisting domestic aggressions, which will not also justify a nation in resisting foreign aggressions. Mr. Sumner, I am aware, attempts to prove, that a nation cannot act on the defensive; but why not, as well as an individual or a city? Suppose Mexico were to send an army into Boston, and commence the destruction of our citizens, stores, dwellings and churches; should we not be defending ourselves by driving the army from our midst, just as much as we should, in quelling a riot, raised by our own citizens? I can see no difference in the two cases. One, to me, is just as much an act of self-defence as the other. Still, it is said, there can be no defensive war! This position, if it has any strength whatsoever, derives it from a false and sophistical definition of war. It is not, as Mr. Sumner says, "A public armed contest between two nations in order to *establish justice* between them." The more correct definition is the common one: *war is a contest between two nations or states carried on by force.* This is the more correct, because nations not unfrequently engage in war, in order to obtain territory, to which they know they have no right. To secure justice has been no object of many of the most bloody wars that have ever cursed the world. Hence, the common definition of war is correct; and a war is *offensive* when commenced to make aggressions upon the rights of others, and *defensive* when a nation thus attacked, seeks to

Digitized by Google

defend itself against its enemy. Consequently, the last war with England was on our part *defensive*, and on the part of England *offensive*. England began it by compelling our seamen to serve in her navy. This was a monstrous aggression upon our rights. Our country promised protection to her citizens; and when they were forced away, and compelled to serve in the navy of a foreign nation, we were bound by our obligations to those wronged citizens, to restore them to their rights, if we could. Thus England made aggressions upon us, and we sought to defend ourselves from those aggressions. The war was not to determine whether it was just for those seamen to be thus impressed; our nation had decided that it was shamefully unjust; but the war was to punish England for her injustice, and make her deliver up our men that she held in bondage.

Wars, then, are not to determine what is just. Such an idea is sheer sophistry. They are, so far as the offensive party are concerned, to obtain what is unjust; and so far as the defensive party are concerned, to obtain what is just; but not to *determine what is just*. That is first determined, before an honest nation seeks its defence. You might as well say, Force employed to resist internal violence, is to determine what is right; as to say, Force employed to resist external violence, is to determine what is right. There may be, then, in a war, a defensive party; and as the principle of self-defence under some circumstances is admitted to be right, a nation may justly engage in war in self-defence.

But this, it is said, is not Christian. Christians, it is contended, should bear and forbear; they should conquer by patience and love. I have great faith in forbearance, patience, and love; I believe that they possess a mighty energy. But gentlemen who appeal to these, and set forth their power in such glowing eloquence, ought to be consistent; and if these are more efficacious in overcoming a national foe, in subduing all national opposition, why not employ them in conquering a mob; in subduing those engaged in the slave trade; in controlling those who res is the laws of the land?[1] Why have courts of justice, and

[1] Mr. Sumner says, in speaking of the navy, "So far as it may be

Digitized by Google

lawyers to plead for the conviction and punishment of criminals? Why have police-officers, jails, and prisons? Why not conquer all offenders by love, restrain all outrages by love, and protect the poor African from the slave stealer, by love? If love is such a panacea in purifying a nation, we should think it might purify a piratical crew, a ferocious band of rioters, and reckless thieves, robbers, and murderers. The truth is, either national resistance of wrong by physical force is right, or the entire doctrine of non-resistance is true. There is no middle-ground on which to stand; and I am amazed that any man, who has the ability to reason, should suppose there is.

I never yet saw but one person who was entirely consistent, that claimed to be a non-resistant; and that person has been again and again pronounced insane; and I have seen that person forced from a non-resistant meeting, by non-resistants themselves! As much as I dislike non-resistant doctrines, I have greatly admired the consistency of the person to whom I refer, and the fidelity with which he adhered to the conclusions which followed legitimately from admitted premises. I remember on one occasion, this person resisted the organization of a meeting, and maintained that as those who called it held that God's law was a sufficient rule for all situations, and as they refused allegiance to all officers of human laws, they had no right to choose a presiding officer, or have any laws for their government. This faithful adherence to legitimate conclusions, exposed the absurdity of the theory, about as fully as does the preamble of the Non-Resistant Society, which reads somewhat after this manner: *Whereas, we disown allegiance to human laws, and believe the divine law a sufficient guide; resolved, that we form ourselves into a Non-Resistant Society, and adopt the following laws for our government*—every one of which was framed by man!

It has been argued by some, that preparations for war, create and strengthen the war spirit; and that penal laws, jails, and prisons create evil desires. But the war spirit we have seen to be the spirit of avarice, of revenge, and

necessary as a part of the police of the seas, to purge them of pirates, and above all to defeat the hateful traffic in human flesh, it is a proper arm of government," p. 56.

Digitized by Google

hatred. In this spirit, and in the desire for fame and glory, war has its origin. The same evil desires which lead to war, lead men to rob, and steal, and murder. How, then, can we suppose that the abolition of the penal laws of the land, would render men just, honest, kind, and faithful? And yet, it is argued, that if we abolish prisons, dismiss all officers of justice, and repeal all penal laws, men will leave off sinning! This is indeed curious logic. Why, then, does God punish? Why does he not act upon this improved philosophy, and cease his work of punishment, and abrogate all his penalties? Perhaps it was the threatened destruction of the old world, which made it so wicked! Who *believes* that the reason why we have thieves is because we have locks upon our houses, and prisons for the punishment of theft? If you would test this philosophy, just abolish the law regulating the right to hold property. Try it for a single year, and see how we should succeed. Reader, this is a dream of enthusiasts; and while it speaks well for their benevolence, it is far from being creditable to their reason or judgment. The fact is, men are selfish, avaricious, revengeful and deceitful; they have not that sense of justice and right, which will keep them always in the path of duty. We need laws, therefore, which define our rights, and the barriers of penalties and prisons and the various means of physical defence, against the inroads of evil, by which we are now protected. Take these away, and the floodgates would be entirely removed, and ruin would come in upon us unobstructed.

In taking this position, I do by no means dispute the power of kindness and love. I would have them employed in all the transactions of life; in framing all the laws of the land; and in the treatment of all who offend against the laws. The instances, however, which are adduced to show the power of love, only go to establish its utility in these ways, and are far from proving that it would be sufficient without law, penalties, or prisons. If you repeal all penalties and abolish all prisons, how are you to hold the lawless, so as to make them feel the power of love? The kind treatment of prisoners is often appealed to, and very justly, to show the power of kindness in reclaiming them; but were the kindness manifested by unbolting the prison doors, and bidding the prisoners go free, they

Digitized by Google

would unquestionably return to their evil ways. But by being held in confinement, and while there treated kindly, they are made to reflect upon their wrong, and see their error. In this way, their higher and better faculties are aroused to action.

The conduct of the Saviour in not condemning the criminal woman, is often appealed to as proof that we should neither punish nor condemn the guilty. But those who refer to this case, forget how he condemned the scribes and Pharisees, and the severe terms in which he denounced their gross hypocrisy, and the terrible punishments with which he threatened them. A heart crushed with a sense of its sin, and beating with emotions of penitence, Jesus would not condemn; but the hardened, reckless sinner, he did condemn, in the strongest language he could employ. There is justice in God as well as mercy; and that justice will use its rod, even though mercy weeps at every blow that is struck.

Thus, I have no faith in the visionary idea, that if we destroyed our forts, converted our ships of war into merchant vessels, and disbanded our militia, we should be safer than we now are. Why suppose that foreign nations are better than our own? We have no such confidence in our own people. The very men that say, Throw to the winds all your means of defence, lock their dwellings when they retire to rest, place their money under the guard of a strong bolt, and cheerfully consent to pay the watchmen that patrol their street by night! Why, look at the idea a moment. Suppose there is no nation but what would have too much magnanimity to attack us, if we should lay down our arms, what would protect us against a horde of pirates? Our seas are thickly covered with piratical vessels, sailing in search of plunder, and attacking, not the armed, but the unarmed, those who have no earthly means of defence, who go out without sword, or spear, or gun. The crews of such vessels, would not live upon the lonely sea, if it were not for fear of the law. They fear the prison and the gallows. Let them but know that our weapons of defence were destroyed, and they would throng our cities, and appropriate to their use whatever they desired. In proportion as man's passions are unsubdued, we need these bulwarks. For all, in society, they are not now needed.

Digitized by Google

The law is for the lawless, and the magistrate holds his office, to be a terror to the evil-doer. But while men continue to prey upon each other, these bulwarks must stand. It is useless to remind us of their annual cost; for if we cannot have society without them, expensive as they are, they are cheap indeed. It is also useless to point us to the havoc of life resulting from the defence of our rights; for we have yet to learn, that their defence costs more blood than their surrender would. Is it not better that a thousand should fall upon the battle-field, than that ten thousand should be slaughtered in their homes?

The truth is, the advocates of the theory we oppose, begin wrong; they unchain the tiger, and then seek to tame him; they let loose the beasts of prey, and then seek to subdue them. War has its origin in base passions; let non-resistants therefore, begin at the seat of the evil. There is where the Saviour began. The prophet thus describes the way in which Jesus will abolish war: "He shall judge among the nations, and shall rebuke many people; and they shall beat their swords into ploughshares, and their spears into pruning hooks; nation shall not lift up sword against nation; neither shall they learn war any more."—This is our theory. Regenerate men; give them moral power to control their passions; teach them their rights and duties; teach them their relations to each other; show them in what their real interests consist; wake up in their hearts a true love, and then you will prepare them for the promised days of peace.

Already has so much been done in this work of regeneration, that we need never have another war. The world is too far advanced in knowledge and virtue for this. Let there be a Congress of nations at once formed; let all questions of dispute be settled by that; let this arrangement be legally effected, and then we may dispense with some of our fortifications and our means of defence. But we would say to the impatient peace-man, Wait till you obtain your substitute for our present bulwarks; be not too much in a hurry to tear down. The days of peaceful glory which you see, are beautiful, and they will come. They are attractive and delightful; already I feel their holy influence; their light beams upon me, and gladly would I hasten their approach. But the fulness of time has not yet come for

Digitized by Google

them to be ushered in; a Congress of nations must first be established; our international relations must be better defined and understood; we must see more clearly than we yet do, the folly of resorting to brute force; and we must have more love for man as man, and more reverence for God. I ask not, then, that the peace-man should suspend his labors; let him work, there is enough to do; but let him not, just yet, tear away the old fortifications, and break down the old bulwarks. Wait till we know what England and France say to a Congress of nations; wait till the Saviour shall have judged among more of the people, and shall have rebuked more by his spirit. Wait till the lion becomes a little more tame and peaceful, and looks with a less fierce eye upon the lamb which is approaching him. O. A. S.

Art. VII.

Literary Notices.

1. A Compend of Christian Divinity. By Sylvanus Cobb. First Edition. Boston: Published by the Author. 1846. 12mo. pp. 432.

This is a popular presentation, as its title indicates, of the chief topics of Christianity, arranged in something like systematic order, and regarded, as will naturally be anticipated, from a Universalist point of view. The Divine Existence, Character, and Government; the Person of Christ, his Divine Mission, Office, and Teachings; the Future Life; and the Formation of Christian Character,—these are the general subjects which may be said to comprehend the several particulars of the Compend; in the discussion of which, however, many texts of Scripture are explained, and principles of interpretation are illustrated. The work, though essentially a Universalist work, differs considerably, in its plan, from other publications which have appeared in behalf of the same faith. It does, indeed, go over much ground which had already been surveyed in them, but with different illustrations, with some different views, and with reference to a more systematic whole. We think it has the advantage of most of them, in its arrangement, and that the manner of its execution does not fall below theirs. It is the product of the author's own thought. Though he has availed himself of many ideas, which were first suggested or developed by others, we can everywhere

Digitized by Google

see that they have gone through the process of digestion in his own mind, and that they take both their form and bearing from his mode of thinking. We may add, that the work is written in the spirit of candor, at the same time that it is marked with great plainness of speech, and with much earnestness. Simple-hearted honesty is always candid, even in its vehemence, and is not so likely to give offence, by its very frankest expressions, as a cavilling disposition by affected moderation of language.

Of course, many things must be omitted, in order to bring within the dimensions of such a book, so wide a plan as one embracing the outlines of Natural and Revealed Religion. It is enough that the leading principles be clearly traced out and defined. It must also be the case, that the author will have some views peculiar to himself, or to a few, which will appear in his treatment of some of the numerous details into which he is obliged to enter; so that our approval of the general doctrine, will not be understood to cover every particular idea. But we heartily recommend the work, in the whole, as a plea that will do good, in behalf of the great principles of Christian truth.

Every real thinker, who attempts to bring his thoughts on religion into a system, and to explain their bearings, will naturally do it with reference only to such points and relations as lie within a certain circle, which may be called his philosophical or speculative horizon. This will be of wider or narrower extent, according to the range which he has been accustomed to take, in his peculiar mode of thinking; but in all cases, it must, of course, be limited, and leave out of sight many questions which would arise were our horizon a little more enlarged. This consideration should always be kept in mind, lest immediate bearings should be mistaken for ultimate bearings, and partial explanations for complete. It would be a child's idea, to suppose that the circle, which seems to shut down on our vision, is an absolute boundary, embracing the whole, and that there is nothing beyond. As to a complete system of Divinity, there is no such thing possible for a finite mind, since the very subject itself is infinite, and goes down to unfathomable depths, as well as up to inconceivable heights.

2. Plato contra Atheos. Plato against the Atheists; or the Tenth Book of the Dialogue on Laws, accompanied with Critical Notes, and followed by extended Dissertations on some of the main points of the Platonic Philosophy and Theology, especially as compared with the Holy Scriptures. By Tayler Lewis, LL. D., Professor of the Greek Language and Literature in the University in the City of New York, *&c., &c.* New York: Published by Harper and Brothers, No. 82 Cliff street. 1845. 12mo. pp. 378.

A VERY neat edition of the Greek, according to the text of

Digitized by Google

Bekker and Ast, with some improvements; illustrated with English Notes, and designed partly for the use of senior classes in college, as well as for more advanced inquirers.

A distinguishing feature of the work, however, is the Editor's Dissertations, filling 286 pages. These are well worth the attentive perusal of every one accustomed to the science of speculative philosophy. They are evidently the product of a strong mind, familiar with abstract reasoning, and are calculated, even by their extreme conclusions, to awaken the spirit of research, in such as are fond of the exercise. The author is extravagantly conservative in his temper, hardly willing to discard a confessedly erroneous system, if it only be old and sanctioned by general usage. A most reverent admirer of Plato, he finds in that philosopher nearly all the elements of the present Orthodox divinity, — perhaps all, except that of vicarious atonement; and, even of this, he seems to think there may be the germ, in the old heathen notion of sacrifices. On no other ground, (it is his own assertion!) can he hope for the salvation of Plato and Socrates. If it be, indeed, absolutely indispensable to his future welfare, we will trust that, in sacrificing a cock to Æsculapius, Socrates unknowingly recognized the vicarious principle of Orthodoxy. We do not think that any thing further can be reasonably demanded of us, in the way either of credulity, or of deference to a narrow bigotry.

As the system of divinity, called Orthodox, was originally devised by interpreting Christianity according to certain modifications of the Platonic philosophy, it can be no hard matter to discover, in turn, the elements of Orthodoxy, more or less developed, in that philosophy, if we only look back upon it through the medium which it has had so great an influence in preparing and fashioning.

3. Oliver Cromwell's Letters and Speeches: with Elucidations. By Thomas Carlyle. In two volumes. New York: Wiley & Putnam, 161 Broadway. 1845. 12mo. pp. 560, 437.

The larger part of these volumes consists, as will be inferred from the title, of Cromwell's Letters and Speeches. Carlyle, however, has contrived to set these documents in such an historical frame-work as makes the whole a sort of picture-gallery, illustrating the character, scenes and progress of the great Revolution to which they belong. By a few simple "elucidations," Cromwell's language is not only rescued forever from the charge so commonly repeated and believed, of confused, unmeaning jargon, but becomes, to our surprise, for the most part clear, always significant, and sometimes very forcible. It is above all graces of oratory or fine writing; puritanic, untrimmed, shaggy with "warts"

Digitized by Google

like his own coarse face, elliptical, but full of meaning, and this direct to the point. No man can read these Letters and Speeches, in a true spirit, without being convinced by them that, of all the distinguished characters in English history, none have been more belied than Cromwell. We feel that his words are not the words of such an half-fanatic, half-hypocrite, as he has been made to pass for. They are the natural, unstudied utterances of a strong man, religious to the very core of his heart. He was, indeed, touched with a stern enthusiasm, which elevated him above scruples, and made him seem perpetually to hear the explicit voice of God in the demands of the times; yet his religious enthusiasm never disturbed his clear insight into the condition and tendency of affairs, and in all his unscrupulous measures, he was evidently conscientious, and profoundly in earnest. To him, life had no play-day; he toiled, as a servant, "beneath his great Task-master's eye." Connect his language with his acts, and the whole goes far to justify the representation given of him in "Heroes and Hero-worship,"—an awful Spirit in times of public corruption, at once a destroying Siva and a renovating Vishnu.

We wished to say something of the manner in which Carlyle has performed his part in these volumes; but who can justly describe the working of so great, so strange a Genius! An eye that looks straight through all "cloth-garments" and other wrappings, steadily into the heart of the matter; a ceaseless play of thoughts, flashing out, in every direction, far into the infinite depths around; a fantastic humor that sets at nought all received usages and proprieties, and that still teaches the profoundest lessons while it runs riot,—all these are here, as in some of his former works. We find here, also, the same dramatico-scenic method of presentation; and considerable of the same grotesque style, which we can hardly wish Carlyle to lay wholly aside,—it is so expressive in his management,—though it affects us to nausea in all his imitators, sometimes even in Emerson. It is, however, of far more importance to mark the great moral principles which Carlyle everywhere lays open at the bottom of God's government of the world, and which he so powerfully enforces in their bearings on political and social welfare. He is the Noah of this age, "a preacher of righteousness" to the English nation, and to other nations, too, if they will heed. If not, another kind of teacher will be sent, as of old.

4. **The History of Charlestown, Massachusetts. By Richard Frothingham, Jr., &c. &c. Charlestown: Charles P. Emmons. Boston: Charles C. Little and James Brown. 1845. 8vo.**

We are glad to see this work undertaken by one so able and

Digitized by Google

disposed to do it justice. The first number only of it is published, as yet, extending to forty-eight pages; and it will be proper to defer a particular notice, till its completion. It may not be unseasonable, however, to observe, here, that the author has given, in this commencement, satisfactory proof of research, as well as of tact in arrangement and narration, and that the publishers have put the work on good paper and print, and furnished a very handsome view of the "McLean Asylum."

The early history of Charlestown will be immediately interesting to the inhabitants of all the neighboring villages, as that town originally included Malden, Stoneham, Woburn, Burlington, and Somerville; a large part of Medford, and a small part of Cambridge, West Cambridge, and Reading.

5. Oration, before the Phi Beta Kappa Society, of Dartmouth College, delivered July 30, 1845. By Leonard Bacon, Pastor of the First Church in New Haven, Ct. Hanover: Sept. 1845. 8vo. pp. 23.

This is a performance of no great pretensions; but like most things which come to us in humility, it contains much sound wisdom and practical truth — much more than a multitude of similar performances, of vastly higher claims. Its object is to present "some thoughts on the relations and the duties of liberally educated men in our age and in our country." He defines a "liberal education" and "a liberally educated man" on this wise: "It is that higher and general education in science and in letters, which is distinguished from common education on the one hand, and from professional education on the other. . . . . A liberally educated man, then, is one whose faculties have been disciplined, and whose mind has been expanded and quickened, not only by that kind of knowledge which is common to the citizens of an enlightened country, and by that which is essential to his own particular occupation in the world, but also by an enlarged circuit of free study in the various departments of learning and science," pp. 4, 5.

With true enlargement of view, the author maintains, that a liberal education should not be confined to "the three learned professions, as they are called." He would have it extended equally to the mechanic, and the farmer, and to men in all the employments of life. He then proceeds to educe some practical inferences in regard to the duties of liberally educated men "in their several professions." He maintains, that "every liberally educated man ought to be a better man in his profession, than if he were not thus educated;" that "the man who has been liberally educated, is prepared to liberalize and elevate any profession which it may be his lot to pursue;" that "liberally educated men in the different professions are related to each other, and

Digitized by Google

they constitute a natural bond of union among all the professions;" and concludes with the consideration of a liberally educated man's "proper usefulness as a member of a local community." Under this last proposition, there are many thoughts worthy of the most profound attention of all liberally educated men, in an especial manner, and which need to be acted upon more generally by them, than they are. F.

6. The Resurrection of Christ, in Answer to the Question, whether he rose in a spiritual and celestial, or in a material and earthly Body. By George Bush, Professor of Hebrew in the New York City University. New York: J. S. Redfield. 1845. 12mo. pp. 92.

THIS pamphlet is a sort of an appendix to the author's "Anastasis," and designed as a reply to some strictures from different sources, upon that work. We cannot but think the professor has made out a pretty strong case logically, in maintaining that Christ rose from the tomb in a spiritual and celestial body, in opposition to the view, that he rose in a material body, which was transmuted into a spiritual and celestial one at the time of his ascension. We cannot regard the question as one of any great importance, except in its logical bearings upon the general subject of the resurrection. Aside from the argument upon the main question, there is, in this pamphlet, a good deal of valuable criticism and instruction upon biblical science. We think the learned author, however, unfortunate in adopting one form of expression in particular, borrowed from the New Church vocabulary, and that is, *inward eye — opening* and *seeing with an inward eye.* The expression is so strange to most people, that common minds would get no distinct or intelligent idea from it. It is adopting strange language to express a very common idea. We think the author greatly liable to criticism, not only in this book, but in most of his writings, on the score of adopting so many Greekisms and Latinisms—such as *theophanies*, *angelophanies*, *psychical*, and the like; *in transitu*, *communis sensus*, *cui bono*, *ipseity*, etc.—with which his style is greatly disfigured and obscured to common minds. All this may do in books written for scholars only, but is absolutely inexcusable in those written for the mass. F.

7. The Soul; or an Inquiry into Scriptural Psychology, as developed by the Use of the Terms, Soul, Spirit, Life, etc., viewed in its Bearings on the Doctrine of the Resurrection. By George Bush. New York: J. S. Redfield. 1845. 12mo. pp. 141.

THIS book, like its predecessor, on the Resurrection of Christ, is an appendix to the "Anastasis." The author takes the ground that man is a threefold being, composed of body, soul, and spirit; that the soul and spirit survive the dissolution of the body, and

Digitized by Google

co-exist together; that the soul "is the true seat and subject of what are commonly called *bodily sensations;*" and that the soul "is legitimately to be regarded as performing the same office for the spirit in another life," that it did "in the present life." These positions he attempts to establish by an appeal to the scripture usage of the terms soul, spirit, and their kindred. How well he succeeds in this, we leave every reader to determine for himself, only remarking that we regard it as a book eminently worthy the attention of all theologians, who take an interest in inquiries of this kind. It is a book for scholars, rather than the mass of society. F.

8. Second Annual Report of the American and Foreign Sabbath Union. Presented May, 1845. Boston: 1845. 12mo. pp. 24.

The object of the association from which this report emanates, as set forth in the second article of its constitution, is this: "By the universal diffusion of information, by united example and kind moral influence, to endeavor to persuade all persons to abstain from worldly business, travelling and amusement, and attend the public worship of God on the Lord's day."

This is an excellent object, and one in which all lovers of their country, religion, and the best and highest interests of their race, can heartily engage; and it is one which ought to enlist the attention and the efforts of every good citizen in our land, especially at the present time. This report is a very respectable one, and we trust it will contribute something to the great object of the association. F.

Digitized by Google

Art. VIII.

The White Mountains.

Final Report of the Geology and Mineralogy of the State of New Hampshire; with Contributions towards the Improvement of Agriculture and Metallurgy. By Charles T. Jackson, M. D. Published by order of the Legislature, &c. Concord, N. H. Carroll and Baker, State Printers. 1844. 4to. pp. 376.

The nearest approach we can find, in the United States, to the natural scenery of Switzerland, is probably in the mountainous region in the northern parts of New Hampshire. We are not, indeed, sufficiently informed concerning the features of the Blue Ridge, in North Carolina, to pronounce on the claims of that region, in this respect; though one of its summits, the Black Mountain, is ranked somewhat higher than Mount Washington. But in the White Mountains, the Franconia Range, and Dixville Notch, it is not the height alone that impresses us; the structure and conformation are often such as forcibly to remind the traveller of the appearances that distinguish the far more gigantic Alps. On this account, as well as for other reasons, the White Mountains especially have become an object of much curiosity and interest. We trust, therefore, that an attempt to give an idea of the scenes they present to the visitor, will not be unwelcome to our readers.

We are not to suppose that the White Mountains stand out by themselves, rising, like Monadnock or Katahdn, from an open country, or running, like some parts of the Green Mountains or the Catskill, in a single chain. Imagine a tract, say twenty or thirty miles across from east to west, and thirty or thirty-five miles in length from north to south, all filled up confusedly with lofty peaks and broad summits, though intersected in different directions by a few deep, long, winding passes; with the Washington Range towering preëminent in the northern and narrower extremity. We mark out this large tract of country as one conglomeration of mountains. Other mountains, indeed, rise off at a little distance around it, particularly on the north and west, and also at the south. The southern wall,

Digitized by Google

as we may call it, of this huge compact mass, is the Sandwich Range, eight or ten miles north of the upper end of lake Winnepiseogee; the eastern limits overhang, and sometimes invade, the last line of townships towards the State of Maine; the northern cannot be so precisely defined, since all the country, in that direction, seems broken up into ridges and separate heights; the western boundary sweeps around from the northeast through the Franconia Notch, and then south,—unless we include the whole of the Franconia chain, which stretches off, like a pile of thunder-clouds, much further to the southwest. We ought to observe, however, that the approach to the Washington Range, direct from the west, up the Ammonoosuck river, is more open than from any other quarter. It may be proper, also, to add, for the sake of distinctness, that, by this latter Range, we mean only the heavy ridge on which Mount Washington itself stands, and which supports likewise the summits of Clinton, Pleasant, Franklin, Monroe, Jefferson, Adams and Madison. It begins at the White Mountain Notch, whence it goes nearly north, bending around a little to the northeast. It is about ten miles in length, if measured along the base, and three or four in width; and is surrounded on all sides by profound gulfs and deep valleys, which separate it from the neighboring ridges.

We think the most interesting approach to the great mountainous region here sketched out, is from the south, —say, from Concord or Dover; especially, as either of these routes carries us along the romantic scenery of lake Winnepiseogee, which no traveller ought to neglect. It was on a sultry day in August, 1844, that we caught our first view of the Sandwich Range, from the high lands, far to the south, in Canterbury. We had passed the Shaker-village in that town, and were beginning to descend the hills northwardly towards Gilmanton, when the lofty mountain-barrier rose before us, about thirty-five miles off, darkening all the northern horizon; its serrated peaks running apparently straight from west to east, where they terminated in the singularly pointed, or wedge-like, summit of Chocorua. Whiteface, the highest of them, is more than 4100 feet, and Chocorua more than 3300 feet, above the level of the sea. For a long distance in our

Digitized by Google

road, we descried other summits, rising out of the solitudes far back of this Range, and dimly revealing themselves through the openings between its points. At first, we took them for summits in the Washington Range, which may, perhaps, be discovered from this place, in a very clear day; but those which we saw, doubtless belonged to the great congregation of mountains, farther to the east, in Bartlett and Jackson; and one of them was, perhaps, the Pequaket or northern Kearsarge. Meanwhile, as we continued to descend, there stood up, on our right, the rocky cones of the Gunstock Mountains in Gilford, about a dozen miles off to the northeast, rising from 2000 to 2400 feet above the level of the sea, and shutting out from our view the waters of Winnepiseogee.

It is no part of our design, however, to describe the approach to this charming lake, which Nature itself taught the Indians to call "the Smile of the Great Spirit." Let us hasten on beyond its mingled forests and waters, and its islands covered with ever-green copse-wood and shrubbery. Let us leave, unnoticed here, the ascent of the romantic "Red-Hill," at its head, and the magnificent panorama from that summit. Bearing off, on a long detour to the east, we pass around the western end of the Ossipee Mountains, and enter, between them and the Sandwich Range, the great valley of the Bear-Camp River, which we follow down, till at length we turn the farther outskirts of Chocorua, at West-Ossipee, sixteen or eighteen miles eastward from Red-Hill.[1] Making a sharp angle, here, we take our course, again directly north, through sandy plains, and a dreary pine-forest of several miles; which, however, is cheered for a considerable distance by a little quiet lake that shines through the trees on our right. The solitude of the wilderness is also relieved by occasional side-glimpses of the peaks of Sandwich, partly concealed behind the rocky mass of Chocorua, hard by in the west; where also a high mountain-rampart, which stretches out like an arm from his shoulders, ranges along parallel with our course towards the north. From the forest, we

[1] The highest summit of Ossipee, according to Dr. Jackson, is 2361 feet above the level of the sea, or 1883 feet above the waters of Winnepiseogee. Red-Hill is estimated, by him, at about 2000 feet above the sea, or 1500 feet above the lake.

Digitized by Google

ascend the moderate but rugged hill, on which Eaton stands, between the much higher eminences, east and west of it. After passing up through the straggling village, we soon gain the highest point in our road, and see the rocky heights on our left, which come off from Chocorua, reaching down to the north as far as Conway, and leaving an inclined gorge, before us, between that ridge and the hills on our right.

We descend this wide gorge but a little way, when the outskirts of the White Mountains, to the northwest of Conway, begin to open upon us: first, Pequaket or Kearsarge, then Double-Head, then Notched-Mountain, &c., with a far-spread host of lower summits,—a majestic and solemn sight! Then, the north side of Mount Washington itself, thirty miles distant, comes out from behind the farther end of the ridge at our left, stretching up higher and higher into the sky, its dark blue mass growing heavier, all the while, as we keep descending, and enlarging the angle of vision past the long line of cliffs. *There* stands the Giant of the White Mountains, slowly rising into the heavens, his head still concealed behind the heights near by, thus leaving imagination to finish the outline. When we first saw the mountain-host that is scattered to the east of Washington, we were disposed to take Notched-Mountain for the summits of Jefferson and Adams. But these points are either not visible from our road, or else not distinguishable amidst the confusion. At length, we come down on the interval of the Saco, after gradually clearing the gorge, and reach

> "that quiet inn
> Which looks from Conway on the mountains piled
> Heavily against th' horizon of the north,
> Like summer thunder-clouds."

Conway, or Chatoquee-Corner, is a small, scattered, but neatly looking village, on the banks of the Saco. The plain, here, stretches off to quite a distance east and northeast; and is bounded, in those directions, only by a low range of hills, which shuts out all the country beyond. The object, however, which at once engrosses the attention of the visitor, is the wild and stupendous congregation of mountains from the north around to the northwest, where

Digitized by Google

Mount Washington, like an enormous pyramid, overtops the whole, at about twenty-five miles' distance on an air-line. He rises in full view, from this place, as the monarch of the host which fills up that quarter of the horizon. Perhaps the apparent height of Washington will, at first, disappoint a beholder who is unused to estimate distances in a mountain-prospect,—it seems so near, not more than eight or ten miles off. But the more he separates the several objects, the more he tries to distinguish summit after summit, and to measure the masses with his eye, the more is he impressed with their enormous magnitude and height. The valley of the Saco makes a wide channel, as it were, from Conway straight up into the very heart of this world of sublimity; so that we contemplate it as in a dioramic view. Off and beyond the apparent end of this long, open perspective, as well as nearer, on either hand of it, is the confused and crowded host of summits, ranging back, stage above stage, to where the Great Spirit, of the Indians, held his fitting abode.

Standing on the green in front of the inn, we see, from the south around to the southwest, hills of a moderate height, from half a mile to a mile off, covered chiefly with pine-forests. Southwest, is the opening of the gorge by which we entered from Eaton. Southwest by west, stands Chocorua, eight or nine miles distant over the neighboring hills, with his sharp peak and naked shoulders of granite. To the west of us, is a low depression in the ridge which comes off from his flanks; and which again rises immediately into a lofty cone, called Moat-Mountain, a mile to the west by northwest of us. Here, the range turns up the left, or western, bank of the Saco. It is to the right of Moat-Mountain, that the grand mountain prospect opens, over the wide valley. Some of the projecting summits, on the left of the river, shut out the distant view of Mount Pleasant, which stands at the southern shoulder of Mount Washington; but apparently at the northern side of this latter, is a lofty pyramid, which we should think to be Adams, were we not assured, on the contrary, that it was one of the Pinkham mountains, north of the town of Jackson. Nearer, and a little more to the right, is the great Notched-Mountain; a huge mass, lying apparently from the southwest to the northeast, in two enormous billowy

Digitized by Google

swells, with a broad opening or notch between, that appears to sink down almost to the base. Next, to the right, and considerably nearer still, is Double-Head Mountain, a high cone with a flat top, which is divided into two narrow summits, by a slight depression between them. Next to the right, and yet nearer, is Kearsarge or Pequaket, another conical mountain, more than 3300 feet above the level of the sea; all granite and loose shingles of slate towards the top, but lower down covered with pine. It stands directly north of Conway, at the distance of eight or nine miles, though it does not seem so far off. Thence, around to the east, are no high mountains; but the range is prolonged by a few respectable hills clothed with pine-forests. The plain around Conway village, from the west to the north, is one or two miles over; and the banks of the Saco and Swift rivers, which here unite, are, in most places, beautifully shaded by thick borders of hard-wood shrubbery and trees. Beyond the great plain to the north-east and east, and over the low ranges of hills, off in that direction, we see two or three round, blue summits, in Maine, peering up on the horizon.

From Conway to the Notch-House. At Conway, all the regular stages for the White Mountains pass the night, so as to reach the Notch-House, thirty-two miles distant, the next day, a little after noon. There are two roads up the Saco, as far as Bartlett; the old, on the west side of the river, and the new, on the east. Let us take the latter, which runs, for the most part of the way, out on the extreme edge of the interval, at the very foot of the hills. The valley is perhaps from two to four miles wide; luxuriant, cultivated in beautiful meadows and rich grain-fields; a soft and charming landscape, shut in on both sides, by the wild and lofty heights. Our road commands a full view of Washington, ahead, though generally bearing a little to the left. On the ridge that overshadows us, at the right of our course, the eye often ranges along past Pequaket and Double-Head Mountains; the left-hand ridge, over beyond the valley of the Saco, is a continuation of Moat-Mountain, covered with pines, where not too precipitous, and sometimes scarred by slides. About three miles from Conway, there is a very magnificent view of

Digitized by Google

Mount Washington, with his sides lighted up by the morning sun, while he seems to smile down upon his gigantic family scattered in the foreground.

Four miles up the valley, from Chatoquee-Corner, we pass through North-Conway, a small, rusty-looking hamlet, which *pretends* to an Academy and two Meeting-houses. About five or six miles further, we reach Bartlett, a tasteful and thriving village of a few houses, with meadows and highly cultivated fields on the internal west, or back, of the town. It stands directly west of Pequaket, — some of the houses on the very outskirts of that mountain, which rises, at the right, nearly 2700 feet above the street. In the opposite range, over on the west side of the valley, we have seen, for some distance in our way hither, two or three lofty precipices of bare rock, a mile and a half or two miles off, which seem to be scarped sheer down to the banks of the river, — a grim and fierce-looking contrast to the smooth, quiet meadows on which they frown. The situation of this little, neat, sheltered village, is charming; the prospect from it, an endless variety of the sublime, ragged, and beautiful. We have, apparently, made but little advance, as yet, towards the distant mountains, which are piled up in the northwest, summit behind summit, with Washington still overtopping the whole; off on either hand of us, are precipices, steep ascents, and forest-covered heights; while to the south, down the road we have travelled, the wide valley of the Saco stretches away nearly straight to Conway, between the two parallel ridges that serve for its ramparts.

Here, however, the long opening into the mountain-region seems to close; or rather, it bears around sharp to the west, and becomes narrower, as well as more broken by inequalities in its surface. As we pass out of the village, we turn short in the same direction; which is the course we are to hold for the next ten or eleven miles. If we look back, after entering this western reach, we see Pequaket towering in the rear, at the eastern end of the valley; but we lose sight of Washington, and of the distant mountains that stand beneath his shadow. We soon cross the river to its left bank, and, passing only now and then a dwelling, we come, in about six miles, to a few scattered farm-houses, small, and mostly old, which are

Digitized by Google

called West-Bartlett. The beauty of the valley has disappeared; the interval has become uneven, poorly cultivated, often uncleared, and shut in rather closely by the ranges on either hand, north and south of us. Ahead, we see, over and far beyond the tall hills that seem to close up the western end of this passage, a long blue summit, sweeping off either way in a jagged outline that comes down from its loftiest point in the sky. Its southern contour has nearly the same form as that of the Washington-Range when seen from Conway or Bartlett; and if we forget the points of compass, we may naturally mistake it for that mountain, though it really stands in the direction of Franconia. Is it Lafayette?

Near the mouth of Sawyer's River, five or six miles beyond West-Bartlett, we begin to veer gradually around to the north again, having left farms, dwellings, and all signs of cultivation behind, and got into a deep, long, winding gorge among the forest-covered mountains, with the stony channel of the Saco under us, on our right. The abrupt heights, on the other side of the stream, are, more frequently than hitherto, stripped bare by slides, though there are, as yet, none of great extent. In about three miles, perhaps, from the turn, we reach a broader opening among the hills, and find a cleared space in the valley. It is near this part of our road, that we must look for the scene of a tragedy, which occurred here, sixty years ago, and which, as related by President Dwight, has often touched our feelings. A young woman, at work in the town of Jefferson, northwest of the White Mountains, had agreed to go with her lover to Portsmouth at the end of autumn, 1785; but finding, on her return from a short absence, that he was already gone, she resolved to follow him. December was far advanced, and the snow deep. There was not a house, then, between Jefferson and Bartlett, a distance of thirty miles, and only a horse-path. Against all the dissuasions of the family, she set out, afoot and alone, came down through the mountain-wilderness, passed the great Notch, and reached this spot. Here, exhausted it would seem, she wrapped herself in her long cloak, lay down under the branches of a bush, which were expanded like a table-leaf by the weight of snow, fell asleep, and was frozen to death. She was found about a

Digitized by Google

month afterwards, by those who were sent out to search for her.

It is but a little distance, from this opening, to the elder Crawford's. When we passed along here, in 1844, our attention was for some time attracted by a soft-colored, dome-like summit that seemed to hang off in the sky, right ahead of us to the north, and high above all the hills which the eye ranged through. Its outline was so remarkably regular, it had so much architectural beauty as well as grandeur, hovering as it did over the northern end of the long vista between the mountains, that we were struck with the suitableness of its name, when a gentleman at the elder Crawford's told us it was the far-famed Mount Pleasant. The elder Crawford's is a large two-story inn, with barns, outbuildings, &c., and a considerable clearing along the bottom of the valley. On the east, the mountains sweep around in a short curve, so as to leave a little semicircular meadow-plat at their base. The highest of them, Mount Crawford, is more than 2000 feet above the road, and its top somewhat over a mile and a half distant, on a straight line. From this place, there is a twelve-mile ascent to Mount Washington, by a bridle-path, turning in to the east of the house, and climbing the heavy, pine-covered summits that form the back-ground of the scene. We, however, proceeded still north, up the valley, with the Saco on our right; over which the steep mountain-sides were often channelled down by torrents, or laid bare by slides. After winding, for five miles more, through the bottom of this defile, we saw the great Notch opening ahead of us, though obliqueing a little to the right of our course; its eastern side stripped bare, and fiercely glaring in the noon-day sun, while the western rampart was partially clothed with bushes up to the very battlements, that are formed by ledges of rock, near the top. In some places, these are nearly perpendicular. The height of the sides may be from 800 to 1000 feet, — perhaps more, for it is very difficult to estimate it, where every thing around is on so gigantic a scale. Our road enters the Notch, by climbing over the *debris* of the great avalanche in which the Willey family perished, — a flood of rocks and sand and gravel, twenty or thirty feet deep, brought down from the western mountain-side. For about two thirds of the way

Digitized by Google

up to the summit, the ruins of the slide lie in a steeply inclined plane, now mostly covered with shrubs; the remaining and upper third is more precipitous, though not destitute of trees. The Saco, here, diminished to a mill-stream, runs at the foot of the opposite or eastern rampart,—the valley, perhaps, sixty rods wide.

It may be well to observe that the striking features of the Notch do not consist in the narrowness of the chasm. We had already passed through portions of the Saco valley still narrower, and shut in by mountains equally high, and almost as steep. But nobody would, for a moment, confound the character of those passes with that of the Notch; so much more savage is this, and so awful in its aspect. What gives its peculiarly imposing appearance, is the form and condition of its sides. At the lower end, where we entered, the eastern side is a stupendous bank of rock and gravel, lying inclined at an angle, perhaps, of sixty degrees, in huge scollops, some of them a half mile wide, stripped naked for the most part, and channelled out by torrents. These come down, we suppose, from heights that rise back in the interior, but are concealed from our view by the top of the parapet. The upper part of this bank is surmounted by perpendicular, and sometimes outjutting, ledges of brownish decaying rocks, which are partially undermined in many places, and in others have fallen down in ruins. They appear to lie in horizontal strata, which are broken also with perpendicular seams. But the western side is obviously of different formation, though of about the same height, and with corresponding turns in its course. The lower part is often not so steep as that on the east, it being more filled up with the *debris* of avalanches; and a greater proportion of it is covered with shrubs and trees. In the upper regions, the ledges are mostly of hard, unseamed, gray rock, standing sometimes in lofty perpendicular precipices, but in other places inclined. On both sides of the Notch, we see, occasionally, beds of torrents that have spouted over the edge of the parapets, and channelled their way down to the valley. Of course, there are still higher eminences in the rear, and the gigantic walls that shut us in, are but the bases of unseen mountains farther back.

In less than half a mile from the entrance of the Notch,

Digitized by Google

we come to the Willey house. Here, in this hazardous retreat, was one of the earliest settlements among the White Mountains, since we find it occupied as long ago as 1797. It stands at the left of the road, which continues to run on the declivity above the western edge of the valley. The house is only of one story, and has three or four small rooms; one or two having been added of late. In the great catastrophe, there were, perhaps, two slides, here, from the western heights; one coming down directly to the house; the other starting from the projection which stands a little to the south. Judging by the place where the bodies were found, it must have been the southern slide, (if both were not one,) that buried them. What we call the northern, threw its *debris* within two feet of the house; where it parted, going on both sides of the building, carrying away the barn; and, leaving a few rods untouched in front of the dwelling, it united again, and swept down to the river. A flock of sheep was found, the next day, gathered on the little space before the house. It is well known, that, had the family remained under their roof, they would have been secure. But they fled in order, probably, to reach a little hut they had built, for safety, at the southern end of the Notch. They had gone only twenty or thirty rods, however, when the ruinous mass came upon them. It was in the night, the latter part of August, 1826, and during one of the most severe tempests of rain that had ever been known. It is supposed, from circumstances, that the catastrophe at the house, took place towards midnight. For two miles up the Notch, and for the remaining half mile at the lower end of it, the slides were almost continuous; and the little cottage, so wonderfully preserved, was one of the few spots of safety, in all that distance. One cannot but try to imagine the terrors of that night, down in this awful chasm of the mountains; the groanings of the tempest above, the bellowings of the thunder reverberated from the overtopping cliffs, the winding sides of the gigantic prison fiercely lighted up by the frequent flashes; in the intervals, the roar of the cataracts up in the heights, and the dashing of the swollen river below; till, at length, the mountain-masses began to rend, crashing down in thunder, or ploughing along with grinding, stunning jar, the ground trembling as in an earth-

Digitized by Google

quake; and all the face of the superincumbent heights, with their ledges and forests, rushing down in one confused movement. Nothing was known of the terrible ruin, till the next day, when a foot passenger found his way through, and gave the alarm at the elder Crawford's, below. Old Mr. Crawford immediately sent to Bartlett, for help, and he himself set out for the scene. In the course of a few days, they succeeded in finding, out of the nine who perished, Mr. Willey and his wife, with two others, under the avalanche that rested about thirty rods south of the house, and which buried up the road twenty-five or thirty feet deep. The bodies were shockingly mangled — torn asunder, and their limbs scattered in different places. Some of them were discovered by the gathering of flies above their buried remains, whither they were drawn by the scent of putrefaction.

On looking back to the south, from this place, down the winding gorge we have travelled, we see, five miles off, Mount Crawford, apparently shutting up the farther end of the valley, and presenting a singular projection at the top, unnoticed before. Let us, however, leave the Willey house, and proceed up the Notch. We shall find it winding, throughout its course, in zig-zags of half a mile or a mile in length, though the tops of the gigantic barrier-walls, being wider apart than at the bottom, are generally visible for a greater distance ahead. It should be observed that the whole length of the Notch is nearly three miles. When about a third of the way through, we cross the Saco to its eastern bank. About half the way through, we see a rivulet coming down the western side, from its summit near the clouds; and about two thirds of the way towards the northern end, is the "Silver Cascade," falling in successive cataracts from the lofty top of the eastern mountain, and, after dashing under the road, the stream rushes into the river. It is quite a brook, in dry times, and presents a very wild, romantic appearance, as it tumbles down through overhanging trees, leaping along its channel, from precipice to precipice. When swollen to a river, its rage must be terrible. A little farther to the Notch, we come to another, but smaller, stream descending in the same way from the eastern mountain.

In the latter half of the passage, the way ascends con-

Digitized by Google

siderably, though it is not very steep for a country road; and the sides of the Notch, perhaps, do not in general appear quite so lofty as at the lower end, though their height may still be reckoned at 800 feet, and in places much more. Neither are they so precipitous, and their faces are more wooded; so that the aspect is not so strange and imposing. The width of the valley still continues at an average, perhaps, of fifty rods; sometimes, indeed, narrower, but sometimes wider. At length, after a pretty steep ascent in the road, we approach the upper end of the Notch; but before we come out into the open world, we must pass through the narrow chasm, called distinctively the Gap, which is about fifty or sixty rods long, and for the most part but just wide enough for the road and the walled-in channel of the Saco, — the whole, in one place, only thirty feet across. We enter it between two cliffs, which rise perpendicularly from twenty-five to forty feet, and which, higher up, fall back towards the sides of the mountains on either hand. Through these ledges, the road and river wind along, so that we never see more than a few rods ahead. On the western side, however, the rock does not continue the whole length; its place being supplied, for part of the way, by an upright wooded bank, which shuts down sharp upon the stream. The Gap seems like a deep artificial excavation. Though ragged and gloomy, it did not strike us, however, with the strange awe we felt in the other parts of the Notch. On emerging around the farther corner, we discover, in a broader opening than we have seen for many miles, a little meadow before us, and on the eastern edge of it, the "Notch-House," about fifty rods distant.

It should be remarked, that the Notch is seen to the best advantage, when approached from the south, and with a noon-day sun to light up its grim and savage features. Under a clouded sky, it loses some of its fierce aspect; and when entered from the north, its terrible grandeur does not break on one so suddenly, as from the opposite direction.

From the Notch-House to Fabyan's. The Notch-House, or Thomas J. Crawford's, stands on the east side of a narrow, but magnificent amphitheatre amidst the

Digitized by Google

mountains; which, however, is open to the northwest and north, unless we regard the heavy forest, in that direction, as a temporary barrier. The oval-shaped bottom, occupied by a meadow, partly swampy, and partly bushy, is about half a mile long from south to north, and a quarter of a mile wide. On the southwest, a very lofty mountain comes quite steeply down, within sixty or seventy rods of the house, and passes around southwardly to form the western side of the Notch. West of the house, and but a little further off, towers another equally tall and steep cone, with a profound gulf between it and the former, into which broad slides have fallen, leaving huge scars on the pine-covered face of the column. The Notch-House, fronting it, is on the foot of the wooded mountain which rises to the east, and which loses itself, behind the trees, up in middle air. This is part of the range that goes around, steeper and steeper to the southeast and south, to form the eastern side of the Notch. Off to the northeast from the house, is a projection of the same mountain, which rises there into a conical top, seen at some distance through and above the intermediate trees.

Standing in front of the Notch-House, we look south into the dusky Gap, for some ten or twelve rods. It is about fifty rods off. Over and beyond it, we see, at the distance of half a mile and onwards, one of the mountains that form the eastern side of the Notch, standing up with a heavy round-capped head, say 2000 feet high. A third of the way down, it becomes so steep as to be almost wholly stripped by slides; and on the extreme edge, where it cuts the sky beyond, the jagged rocks are decayed, and fallen or torn out, leaving a very irregular outline, in some places perpendicular. This ruinous and sheer-descending pile is the farthest object to be seen in that direction. Its peculiar conformation, the blank opening to the right, or west, of it, together with the nearer entrance of the Gap, would lead the spectator, even though an utter stranger, to anticipate something of the wild and stupendous scene in the pass which lies down so deep under its cliffs. He would be aware that he was approaching a fearful gorge through the mountains. Standing, still, before the Notch-House, let us fix our attention on the entrance to the Gap. Its left abutment is the perpendicular, or rather over-

Digitized by Google

jutting, face of a rock, say twenty-five feet high; but still further to the left, the mass of ledges, all tumbled together, runs up back to the height of 100 or 130 feet, fashioning itself into what is called "the Elephant's Head." It requires, indeed, but the help of a little imagination, to make out such a profile, with the eye marked in it, and with the snout ending down at the Gap; though it must be confessed that, of three or four spectators, no two are apt to agree *where* the eye is, while they nevertheless agree that there is the profile, and that there is the mark of an eye, somewhere. There is a tradition, that the road once ran over the top of this Elephant's Head; turning up the mountain-side, a little to the north of the present house, and after crossing the forehead of that rocky mass, coming down a precipitous descent, over at the further end of the Gap. The Gap itself is said to have been originally impassable, on account of the fragments of rocks that lay on the bottom. If so, they must have been cleared out more than fifty years ago, long before the present turnpike was carried through.

The main branch of the Saco, that we have followed up, rises in the little meadow in front of the house. Through the Gap, it is but a rivulet during the dry season; and its channel is here and there walled in, to leave space for the road.

The wood, on all these mountains, is generally pine; except on that which rises back of the house, and which is covered, as far up as it stands in sight, with hard wood. This is the lower part of Mount Clinton, as we found on ascending the Washington-Range.

The only dwellings, in the long pass through the mountains, are, 1st, an old hut, with a little clearing around, some miles below the elder Crawford's, and not far from where the valley turns again to the north. 2d. The elder Crawford's, already described. 3d. The Willey House, more than five miles thence. 4th. The Notch-House, nearly three miles onwards; a decent, two-story inn, with outbuildings. 5th. Four miles and a half to the north by northwest of this, is Fabyan's, (formerly Ethan A. Crawford's, and still earlier, Rosebrook's,) a spacious and rather elegant hotel, with out-houses, and a large cleared farm on the banks of the Ammonoosuck. 6th. Half a mile further,

Digitized by Google

northwest, Ethan A. Crawford's; a two-story inn, built within a few years, but apparently not very well kept. The clearing extends from Fabyan's a little past this house, around to the west; in which direction the road here begins to bear.

From the Notch-House, the direction, up over Mounts Clinton, Pleasant, Franklin, and past Monroe to the top of Washington, is about northeast; and the distance by the path, including all its curvatures, both lateral and vertical, is from seven to eight miles. But none of the higher regions of the Washington-Range are visible from this place; nor had we seen any of them, after losing sight of Mount Pleasant, a little this side of the elder Crawford's. If we proceed to Fabyan's, however, we shall be at the west of the Range, and have its broad side towards us, so as to see the whole of its outline marked against the sky, with the several summits, like huge towers, rising above, in their relative positions. A description of the ascent will, then, be much better understood.

Starting from the Notch-House, and following the turnpike north, we soon enter the hard-wood forest, through which the road proceeds, descending on the whole, for about three miles and a half; near the end of which, we cross a small brook, one of the sources of the Ammonoosuck. On clearing this forest, the great plain of the Ammonoosuck opens around, stretching wide off to our right, and extending in front; Fabyan's, appearing on its northwest border, a mile ahead. We call it a plain; it is the level bottom of a vast amphitheatre, some six miles in diameter, enclosed apparently by mountains on all sides, except that on which we enter, — and even *here* is quite an ascent. The western part of it is cultivated in fine meadows, — a delightful rarity, after our long seclusion among the mountains. The rest of it is mostly covered with a pine-forest; through which the wide, stony channel of the Ammonoosuck, frequently obstructed with drift-wood, is seen, in all its winding course from the foot of the Washington Range in the east. In heavy storms, the mountain-torrents must swell it to a raging flood. Looking, from Fabyan's, eastwardly over the plain, *there* stands, at the distance of five or six miles, the immense Washington-Range, "rising from out the silent sea of pines,"

Digitized by Google

with its bald heads and naked pinnacles frowning in mid-heaven. At the right-hand extremity, to the southeast, is Mount Clinton, with its summit elongated west and east, 2300 feet above the plain. Its top is connected with Mount Pleasant, by a lower ridge, that recedes back from us; the mountain-wall being scolloped out, here, by a broad gulf that comes down from the heights. At the left, Mount Pleasant swells out forward, for half its bulk, and carries its smooth, round head considerably higher than Clinton. On the north, the outline sweeps down from the brow to the short wing that joins it with Franklin. This latter summit stands a little back; and here again is a broad gulf scooped down the Range. Franklin seems to rise but little higher than Pleasant; towards which it advances, like a bluff, rock-bound promontory; while in the rear it ascends, in a long inclined plane, towards Washington. Mount Monroe, consisting of two sharp, rocky points, appears to stand on the summit of Franklin, due east from Fabyan's. Next comes Mount Washington, towering to the north of Monroe; its high peak standing farther back, though such is its bulk, that its body, in the lower regions, advances forwards. From its northern side comes down a narrow shoulder; on the lowest depression of which stands the double summit of Mount Jefferson. It then runs on still north, and rises to the steep pyramidal peak of Adams. Mount Madison, another regular pyramid or cone, stands back to the northeast of Adams, and partly behind it; from which it appears almost isolated, as there is apparently no ridge connecting the two, though both spring from the same continuous range at the base.

The northern section of this Range, consisting of Washington, Jefferson, Adams and Madison, is higher than the southern,[2] and of a much sterner aspect. The majestic peaks are immense regular pyramids, except Jefferson, and

[2] The height of the summits above sea-level has, latterly, been reckoned as follows: Madison, 5608 feet; Adams, 5961; Jefferson, 5859; Washington, 6428; Monroe, 5510; Franklin, 5048; Pleasant, 4917. Dr. Jackson, however, makes Washington 200 feet lower; which agrees very nearly with Capt. Partridge's estimate. Perhaps we ought to make the same deduction in respect to the other summits. According to Dr. Jackson's Barometrical Observation, Clinton is about 4100 feet above the sea. Capt. Partridge calculated the base of the range at 1770 feet above the sea.

Digitized by Google

all strown thick with stones of a brownish hue, which seem to have shelved down towards their pine-covered base. The peaks of Monroe are likewise piles of naked rocks, but blacker, larger, and more fixed. The southern section of the range, consisting, if we except Monroe, of Franklin, Pleasant and Clinton, has a smoother aspect, and its summits are swelling, or level, rather than pointed. They seem like a series of gigantic steps, leading up to Washington. The length of the whole mountain-base, as seen from Fabyan's, is perhaps about eight miles, though it does not appear so long; the section south from Washington may be reckoned at five miles.

Ascent of the Mountains from the Notch-House. August 9th. The morning was pleasant below; but fleecy clouds were abroad in the sky, and thick mists enveloped the upper parts of the two tall pinnacles before us at the southwest, as well as the heavy rock-ribbed summit that stands up, south, over the Notch. We were encouraged, however, to think that the vapors would pass away, and that we might have a clear prospect by the time we should reach Mount Pleasant. At half-past seven, we set out, — a motley cavalcade of a dozen or sixteen ladies and gentlemen, in rather fantastic dresses, and on old broken-down horses, which are kept here for the purpose. In a straggling Indian-file, we took the well-worn bridle-path, which turns in to the northeast, around the corner of the Notch-House; and immediately began the ascent, through the hard-wood forest. Upwards we went, at a very slow walk, furlong after furlong, holding our course about northeast, and climbing up obliquely across what seemed to be the southwest acclivity of the mountain. At times we looked back, through vistas between the trees, to the opposite mountain-sides of the deep amphitheatre we had ascended from; the bottom of which, however, sank below our view. Our narrow path was often a bed of mud, at other times a channel of two or three feet in depth, washed out from the tangled roots by torrents. For the larger part of the way, it tacked, in long zig-zags, over difficult ascents. Sometimes it ran over easy slopes, and now and then it lay, for a little distance, nearly on a level; but everywhere an unbroken canopy of foliage stretched

Digitized by Google

overhead and around, as far as the eye could penetrate through the trees. When we had thus climbed nearly two miles through the silent continuous forest, in about an hour and twenty minutes after starting, we reached "the spring," so called; a little basin of pure mountain-water, from which we eagerly drank. We had now risen above most of the hard-wood, and got among pines, with here and there a white-birch. The trees were already rather diminutive, though their height, as yet, bore a fair proportion to their size.

Ascending again, and occasionally climbing, as we had done before, over long flights of corduroy footpaths, in about twenty-five minutes after leaving "the spring," we came out of the high woods, on the northwest brow of Clinton. In an instant, Mount Pleasant, with its great high dome of pale, dingy yellow, stood full before us, north by northeast, distant apparently not more than three fourths of a mile. Past its western side, Jefferson and Adams towered up beyond; their peaks capped with mists, as we had feared. Washington was concealed, either by a cloud, or by Mount Pleasant. Nothing can exceed the grandeur of this first and sudden view, lifted as we were high over the profound depths near by at our left, with part of the Ammonoosuck plain lying far beneath us, encircled by its mountains, and all the northwest open to the utmost horizon.

Here we enter the dwarf mountain-fir; at first, about six or seven feet high, the trunks half-stripped of bark, and bleached white by the weather. These are succeeded, within a few rods, by shrubs still more stunted, till they are only two and three feet in height; mere scrags, which, instead of rising upwards, spread their branches out along the moss, and cling to the surface, somewhat like parslain in a garden. Through this tangled mass, the path leads us, in half a dozen minutes, to the top of the ascent, on the northern brow of Clinton; the summit itself rising some twenty or thirty rods on our right. This is about two miles and a half from the Notch-House.

The top of Clinton is rocky, though the ledges are, for the most part, either level with the surface, or but slightly swelling above it. Its only vegetable covering is thick moss, a few wild cranberries, &c., with scattered patches

Digitized by Google

of the dwarf mountain-fir. The prospect which opens, in a clear day, from the southeast, around east, and northeast, to the northwest, is vast and magnificent; but we found all the eastern quarter filled with a sea of rolling vapor, which was driving towards us. Over it, nothing but the tops of mountains, like wooded islands, was visible in that direction. Nor shall we describe the view in the western quarters of the horizon, till we reach Mount Pleasant. On a subsequent visit, with clearer weather, we here saw Washington, back behind and partly over Mount Pleasant, in a line somewhat to the right of the latter.

On this spot, a singular phenomenon was observed, a few years ago, by Thomas J. Crawford. Being here, with another gentleman, about seven o'clock in the morning, he saw a rainbow-circle, some four feet in diameter, painted on a sheet of thin mist that hung, near by, over the gulf which sinks down from the summit. The circle was complete, except on the lower side, where was an opening large enough to admit a man's shoulders. In the centre, was the appearance of a human face, which he recognized as his own, surmounted by a cap, such as he then wore. From the outer rim of the circle, there beamed out rays of light, all around, to the length of a foot and a half, or two feet. We shall not attempt to account for this peculiar coincidence of reflection; we only give the fact, as described to us by Mr. Crawford. The gentleman with him had a hat instead of a cap. He, too, saw a like circle, and in it a human countenance; but Mr. Crawford did not inquire of him whether there was the appearance of a hat on the head, as was probably the case.

On the brow of Clinton, particularly where we begin to descend at the northeast, we come to the first of those great gulfs that sink apparently to the base of the mountain. It falls off, here, on our left hand, within a few feet of our path, and goes shelving away down towards the valley of the Ammonoosuck. The first impression, on looking down, is, that a fall over the edge would send us rolling to the bottom; but the truth is, these gulfs appear, to one unused to such scenes, much steeper and more dangerous than they really are. There is a peculiar sensation of buoyancy, while traversing these airy heights,—a slight and rather pleasurable feeling of insecurity, which uncon-

Digitized by Google

sciously affects the vision so far as to sharpen the angles of descent, and to give every thing somewhat of an imaginative appearance. On a clear day, we can see that there is another abyss off on the other side of us, at the southeast; but the nearest part of the edge is thirty or forty rods distant.

We descend, nearly east, through low, stunted shrubs, and patches of the dwarf mountain-fir, into a little forest that reaches to the foot of the first hill. Thence, we rise again over a lower rocky eminence, mostly bare; and turning gradually around towards the north, we follow the heavy mountain-shoulder, down again, through one or two bogs, and some bleached shrubs, to the broad, swelling, pasture-like base of Mount Pleasant. Ascending this, about due north, we arrive at what may be called the foot of the dome. Here, we rise up the grass-covered side, by long zig-zags, which render the path of tolerably easy ascent. A practised footman may, by hard climbing, go straight up the dome. On reaching the summit, the attention is, for a moment, engrossed by the mountain itself. At a distance, the perfect symmetry of its form renders it strikingly beautiful as well as grand; nor do we feel disappointed in this immediate view. The top, embracing five or six acres, is smooth enough for a parade-field. Swelling up to the centre, it slopes gradually away in every direction. Like the sides below, it has even a verdant appearance, as it is everywhere covered with short stringy grass, which grows, in little tufts, to the height of four or five inches. Among these tufts, mountain-flowers are scattered, which add life and beauty to the scene.

But all its attractions cannot long detain the excursive eye, which, directed to the northeastward, is caught by the towering majesty of Mount Washington, with his dark and grisly head standing off, apparently, not more than a mile and a half from us, high in the air. On our first ascent, however, it was all covered up with clouds. We describe the scene as it struck us in our second visit. A little short of Washington, appear the two rocky piles of Mount Monroe; of which the eastern, or higher, goes abruptly down to the edge of the mountain-range, in that direction. Franklin, on which they seem to stand, comes gently descending towards us, in a ridge of no great width

Digitized by Google

at the top, and ends in a square-faced headland, that appears not more than half a mile distant to the northeast, over the intervening abyss. To look in that direction, gives one a feeling of uneasiness; for it is evident that, in order to reach Franklin, we must traverse that abyss, which seems to fall down far below the line of our vision.

If we look to the eastward, over and beyond the neighboring gulf which sinks unfathomable along all that side of the Washington-Range, the prospect is filled up, for some distance, by the host of mountains that extend towards Maine. Southeastwardly, we look off into the deep valley we had travelled in our journey, and in it distinguish a solitary edifice, — the elder Crawford's, — and beyond that, some of the settlements between the mountains of Bartlett. Nearly due south, stands old Chocorua, lifting his wedge-like summit into the sky, at the distance of about twenty-five miles. Turning around to the northwestward, we see the settlements in Jefferson, fifteen or sixteen miles off, with the mountainous country beyond. At the west, we look down on the bottom of the great amphitheatre in which Fabyan's stands, and trace the course of the Ammonoosuck as on a map. Farther off, in that direction, we see the forests and settlements of Bethlehem; and away, at a dim distance, beyond the great depression of the Connecticut River valley, is the blue range of the Green Mountains, with its waving outline stretched high across the sky. To the southwest, over the tall peaks in front of the Notch-House, stand the dark-blue summits of Franconia, actually looking down upon us. We had expected to see over them, as far as to Moosehillock, in that direction. But they shut out all that quarter of the horizon, towering evidently to a height considerably above us. Casting our eyes down over the head of Clinton, we see deep into the narrow amphitheatre of the Notch-House, and mark the huge scars on the opposite mountain sides. The prospect from Pleasant is, perhaps, in some respects, more satisfactory to a transient visitor, than that from Mount Washington, where the vastness of the unbroken panorama oppresses, and for a while confuses, us. *There*, we are literally above the world; *here*, we are still connected with the scene on which we gaze, and the sense of lonely elevation is relieved by objects still higher than ourselves. But let us proceed.

Digitized by Google

We go, over the brow of the dome, down to the northeast, towards the projecting end of Mount Franklin; on the ridge of which, and a little farther off, we have the two rocky peaks of Monroe before us; and beyond and above all, the dark pyramid of Washington. Our path is, at first, of moderate descent, but grows steeper and steeper towards the gulf below; while, at our left, the mountain sinks down abruptly to the plain of the Ammonoosuck, over which we seem to be suspended. After descending the side of the dome a third of a mile, we reach the point where its base goes down almost perpendicularly under us. Here begins a series of short sharp zig-zags, passing alternately to the right and left, one reach almost beneath the other, till we land at the bottom. It is curious to mark the skill with which the horses pick their way, in a narrow stony path, down these precipitous descents; sometimes reaching down their foot to try the spot, but recovering their step, if not satisfied of its safety. We confess, it is rather more pleasant to descend this flight, on foot, than on horse-back; yet all the ladies in our company retained their seats in the saddle, unpractised as most of them were. The encouragement of the gentlemanly and noble-hearted guide naturally gave them a degree of confidence which, perhaps, they would not otherwise have felt. At the bottom, we came again to patches of dwarf mountain-fir; of which we had seen none since we began to climb the other side of Mount Pleasant. Here, too, we find, in the narrow space, a little pond at our right, a few rods in circumference, surrounded by ledges and by long reddish moss. In heavy rains, part of its waters fall off to the east, down the gulf towards a branch of the Saco, and part of them to the northwest, towards the Ammonoosuck; but at other times it has no outlet.

After crossing obliquely over one or two rocky elevations, that slope wide down to the west, we begin the ascent to the brow of Franklin, by climbing northwardly, or rather in gentle tacks, up the end of the mountain, on moss, short grass, and ledges. All the way, the prospect is open, towards the northwest, over the deep valley of the Ammonoosuck, and extends towards the southeast, horizontally across the great gulf on our right, to the mountains beyond. When we reach the brow of Franklin, if

Digitized by Google

we are considerably in advance of our party, it is a romantic sight to look back and see the cavalcade winding down the acute zig-zags near the foot of Mount Pleasant, — file under file passing in opposite directions, and thus weaving their way backwards and forwards on the face of the seeming precipice; while a laggard or two are seen, like insects, high on the upper part of the dome, creeping down to overtake their companions.

In the first ascent, we had but just reached the brow of Franklin, when the clouds, which had been driving in stormy masses up the eastern side of the Range, begun to flit around the top of Mount Pleasant in our rear. First, its more advanced scuds swept the summit like long streamers of thin gauze, through which we saw the enormous dome now glimmering in sunshine, now half concealed in the driving rack; again, it stood out bare for an instant, but in deep gloom, under the bellying folds of the storm; and then, disappearing as suddenly, nothing more was to be seen in that quarter, but one blank mass of dark-rolling vapor. We ourselves were soon wrapt in the cloud; and from this time onwards, our prospect, if so it may be called, was limited to a few rods, till we had ascended Washington, and returned as far as Mount Pleasant. But on our second visit, we were favored with a pretty clear view, for most of the way up and back.

Franklin is a long and rather narrow summit, rising considerably towards the north by northeast. On the top, its surface is partly covered with mountain grass, like that of Pleasant, and partly formed by ledges of rough, mossy granite, sometimes lying even with the ground and sometimes standing above it. When the traveller has gained this height, he will have Mount Washington in view, directly before him, nearly all the rest of the way. Going onwards, about a fourth of a mile from the brow, we find the ridge suddenly contracted to a width of only three or four rods; and here, a few steps to the right of our path, is the edge of the abyss on the eastern side, which falls down perpendicularly several hundred feet, and then slides off thousands of feet more, to the profound depth in which the forest-covered branch of the Saco runs. Beyond, are the mountains which fill all the region towards Maine; around to the south and the west, the prospect is nearly

Digitized by Google

the same as from Mount Pleasant. It may be well to remark that, thus far, a spectator standing at Fabyan's with a strong spy-glass, can follow us, in our progress, nearly all the way from the top of Clinton. We are indeed concealed from his view, for a while, on the eastern descent of that summit, and again while going up the southern side of Pleasant, and also at the zig-zags that lead down towards Franklin.

Proceeding onwards, the ridge widens again; and in a few minutes we come to a considerable ascent, which is probably regarded as the base of Monroe, — though it is difficult to fix the dividing line between this mountain and Franklin. The ascent, here, is made obliquely over the southeastern face of the swell, which spreads out wide, all covered with rocks and large stones, with tufts of mountain-grass between. From the higher part of this ascent, the path formerly continued to run up north, between the two peaks of Monroe, instead of bearing around to the northeast, as it now does; and it then came down into the present track, again, at Blue-Pond. Even now, the more enterprising visitors sometimes cross directly over the eastern or higher peak, — a pyramidal mass of naked rocks, dark and jagged, heaped on each other up to a point five hundred feet above the broad swelling platform over which we are passing. We follow up the present path northeastwardly over the shoulder of the ascent; then, along the eastern side of the Range, and slightly descend through a stony tract between scattered boulders that have rolled down from the left. The edge of the eastern abyss is down some thirty or forty rods at our right. In about fifteen minutes from the shoulder of the ascent behind us, we reach the southeastern foot of the higher peak of Monroe. Here, it shuts down so abruptly on the edge of the Range, that the path is carried around the precipice, for two or three rods, on a shelf built out over the gulf at our right. This is the spot, perhaps, the most trying to weak nerves, of any in the whole way. And yet, if we stop, and look steadily down the abyss, till the eye measures the angle of descent, a great part of the danger disappears. The mountain-side falls off very rapidly, indeed, perhaps at an angle of forty-five degrees, to a profound depth, and then less abruptly down to the forests that embosom the

Digitized by Google

branch of the Saco. We are suspended on the rim of a semicircular gulf, which goes down, like the side of an immense tunnel, for thousands of feet; the projecting base of Mount Washington coming almost under us from the north, and that of Franklin from the south. Opposite and over the deep branch of the Saco, is still the host of mountains towards Maine. Having passed this precipice, we continue to descend gradually on rocky ground, for a fourth of a mile, around the eastern side of Monroe, and reach the smooth grassy plain at the base of Washington.

Here, immediately under a ridge of moderate height on the west, lies Blue-Pond, an oval sheet, perfectly transparent, and covering three fourths of an acre. Not a living thing is to be seen in the waters, at this elevation; no bush, no weed, not a vegetable grows around, except the thick mat of mountain-grass. We are considerably more than 3000 feet above the base of the Range, and nearly 5000 feet above the sea. The surface of the pond is almost level with that of the little grassy plain in which it is set, like a mirror, and which forms a wide border on the north and east. We observed no outlet; it is said, however, to be one of the heads of the Ammonoosuck, its waters running off to the northwest, and thence down the face of Washington. This mountain towers above us, northeast; at the east, the great gulf on that side of the Range sinks out of sight, from the edge, which is some thirty rods distant. Reposing here, for a few minutes, we are struck with the dead silence, that seems to be felt. This is, indeed, the case, whenever the wind is still, in every part of our route from the top of Clinton. No sound of bird, not an insect's hum, breaks the stillness; and we are too far above the world to be reached by any echo from the regions below. In our first ascent, we indeed saw, when on Franklin, two eagles, careering high above us, and heard their screams, as they battled with the stormy clouds that swept overhead. On our second visit, while resting here, we watched the mists that, from time to time, drove across the head of Washington. For an hour or two, a squally shower had been moving along the country from the northwest. When we stood on Clinton, we saw it gathering, in the farthest distance, over the dim outline of the Green Mountains; on Pleasant, it was streaking

Digitized by Google

down upon a little tract in the far-off Connecticut River valley; on Franklin, we traced it slowly sweeping, like a huge besom, the plains in the neighborhood of Lancaster. But at Blue-Pond, the main cloud was concealed by the ridge above us at the west. Now and then, a volume of white mist, one of the *avant-couriers* of the shower, swept the lofty cone, here rolling in dark masses around it, there flickering in thin streamers across it, — faintly disclosing its glimmering side through a strange mixture of sunshine and obscurity; but soon passing off to the east, it left the heavens all clear around the summit.

From Blue-Pond, our course is nearly north, winding up the southwestern and western side of the mountain. The top is not far from a mile distant, and nearly 1500 feet above us. First, on leaving the grassy plain, we ascend a sort of platform, on which the huge pyramid stands, — rocks and fragments of rocks thickly scattered all around. Then passing forty or fifty rods over this gently swelling area, we reach the foot of the pyramid itself. From this point, the path rises very steep through and on a vast expanse of rough, jagged blocks and slabs of mica slate, for half a mile; when we come to a little inclined plat of grass, several rods in diameter, and apparently full of springs, on the western forehead of the mountain. Here, the horses are usually left, though they are sometimes ridden to the very summit, which is less than a quarter of a mile above. Soon after we began the ascent at the foot of the pyramid, we looked down, at some distance to our left, on a small pond, among the all-surrounding rocks, called the Lake of the Clouds. It is the northeast head of the Ammonoosuck, and discharges its waters in a channel down the western face of the mountain. All the way up, we had the great plain of the Ammonoosuck beneath us; in our rear, were the summits we had passed over, and then the country behind to indiscernible distance. From the spot where the horses are left, we climb a very steep and rough path, almost directly east; and in a few minutes we stand on the top of Washington.

Who shall describe the scene that lies outspread, all around, to the utmost verge where the dim earth and heavens mingle! It does not burst suddenly upon us, for it has been opening, and enlarging, and changing, all the

Digitized by Google

way from Clinton. But here, for the first time, the stupendous panorama is complete, and we look down and off upon the whole, ourselves standing alone above the world. Oh God! how great and wonderful are thy works!

The senses are perplexed; the prospect lies in mysterious confusion. It is as if the universal face of the earth had been harrowed and broken up by some immeasurable drag that has passed over it since we left it this morning; mountains and hills furrowed down into diminutive ridges, or levelled off into yonder seeming plain that sweeps around the dim horizon, — that horizon which rises in the sky, and forms the rim of the world-wide basin in which we stand. After a few moments, however, we get the points of compass, and things begin to come into order. Yonder, in the utmost northwest, is the northern end of the Green Mountain ranges; and, past their extremity, we may discern, with a strong eye and a very clear atmosphere, a little smooth surface like polished blue steel. Is it water, or an illusion of the sight? Perhaps Lake Memphremagog, in Vermont. *There* stands the dim barrier of the Green Mountains, from the northwest around to the southwest, seventy and ninety miles distant; but of all those shadowy summits yonder, which is Mansfield? and which, Camel's Rump? which of those, in the farthest southwest, is Killington-Peak? Here, in the latter direction, though apparently but a few miles off, are the Franconia Mountains, standing up face to face with us, rivals of Washington. This highest summit among them must be Lafayette, with his ragged cliffs of granite;[3] but which is old Haystack? and where, yonder, is Moosehillock, among the summits in the rear? That region, into which we look off, in the north, is Canada; and, nearer, the broken tract of mountains, "thick as meadow mole-hills," in the upper end of New Hampshire, — among them, the crags of Dixville Notch, and, farther off, the northern Camel's Rump.[4] Those faint

[3] According to Dr. Jackson, Lafayette is 5067 feet above the sea, or 1161 feet lower than Washington; but the difference does not seem so great.

[4] This is on the line between New Hampshire and Canada; and, according to Dr. Jackson, is 3615 feet above the sea.

Digitized by Google

blue cones, in the northeast, must be Mounts Bigelow and Abraham, seventy miles off, in Maine, directly in the point of the far more distant and indiscernible Katahdn. In the southeast, that level dark line which melts into the sky, away beyond the waters of Lake Sebago, may be the ocean off Portland. Here stands old Chocorua, again, at the south, and, to the right of it, the serrated range of Sandwich; and there, beyond, is the southern end of Lake Winnepiseogee; while off in that direction the level country fades into the clouds that overhang Massachusetts. Still further to the right, the Great Monadnock may be guessed out, more than a hundred miles off, among the dim points that indent the horizon. But the eye tires, and the brain too, in the attempt to sweep around the vast circle of vision, and to single out the objects that become more and more developed as we gaze.

It is remarkable how distances are diminished in this prospect. Umbagog and Mooseluckmaguntic Lakes, which are from nearly forty to sixty miles off, at the east of north, seem to spread out their tangled arms, down yonder, at a distance of not more than eight or a dozen miles. All around from the northeast to the south, the seeming plains, in the distance, are studded, or glazed as it were, with sheets of water; Kezer's and Lovell's Ponds, south of east, in Maine, thirty miles; then, southeast, Sebago Lake, much farther off, with its sister lakes; at the south, Ossipee Lake, and the broader face of Winnepiseogee. Nor are villages and settlements wanting, to variegate the scene; though they are scattered but thinly over the expanse, and wholly disappear in the remote prospect. In the northwest, Jefferson and Lancaster; at the west, Fabyan's, down beneath us, and the enclosed plain through which we trace the Ammonoosuck off into Bethlehem; at the southeast, Bartlett and Conway, in the valley of the Saco; at the northeast, a few dwellings in Shelburne, at a great depth, together with the still deeper channel of the Androscoggin, running in full view, for many miles, among the mountains. It will be remembered that the neighboring country, from this quarter around by the east to the southwest, is one conglomeration of mountains. On all these we look down, except the

Digitized by Google

peak of Adams, hard by, and the summit of Lafayette in Franconia; both of which seem nearly on a level with us.

The top of Washington is a circular area, an acre or two in extent, all covered with jagged blocks and slabs of mica slate. On the eastern side, two ledges rise a little above the surrounding surface; and the southern of these, which is rather the higher, is distinguished by a small column, built up of rough stones, to mark the summit of the White Mountains.

In our first ascent, we were enveloped in a dense cloud, the latter part of the way, so that we saw but a few rods. On the summit, the steady blast wrestled with the dark crags, groaning and roaring around them, like a gale through the masts and shrouds of a vessel at sea. Though there was no rain, it blew the cold, chilling vapor through our garments, till the water dripped from our hats and benumbed fingers. On our second ascent, we gained the summit a few minutes before the shower reached us. It presented one of the most imposing sights that imagination can conceive. There, a little way off to the west, came the cloud, partly below and partly above the level on which we stood; its dark mass bellying in, like a huge concave mirror, and the sun shining obliquely into its bosom. It hung down below the line of vision, and reached up to a great height; all apparently solid, except in the outskirts, where lighter mists were playing and rolling about. Onwards it drove, and in an instant covered us with a furious snow-squall, which whitened all the face of the rocks. This was on the 12th of August, a little past noon. In fifteen or twenty minutes, the cloud swept by, opening broad vistas to the northeast and southwest, and leaving those quarters, to the farthest horizon, as clear as crystal. Again, we were wrapped in the next cloud that followed; and again the squall passed off, opening other vistas. This was repeated continually during the two hours we remained on the summit. We then set out on our return; and after a descent of three hours and three quarters, we arrived at the Notch-House, quite exhausted, but with a store of images and reflections that will last us the remainder of life.

There are two other bridle-paths to the top of Washington. One is from Fabyan's, around the southern border

Digitized by Google

of the plain of the Ammonoosuck, and then along its eastern side, to the foot of the mountain; which it ascends on the western face. About three-fourths of a mile below the summit, it passes a stone-hut, built for the accommodation of visitors; and a little way from the top, it enters and follows the path from the Notch-House. It is said to be the shortest of all the routes, but more fatiguing, and less varied in interest. The other is from the elder Crawford's, twelve miles in length, coming up from the south by east. Visitors generally prefer the route from the Notch-House, on account of the occasional relief the descents afford, as well as for the additional views obtained from the several summits over which it passes. H. B.[2d.]

Art. IX.

The Death-Penalty.

The spirit of a penal code must represent, with tolerable exactness, the moral feelings of the people that make and sustain it. Their ideas of justice and retribution, their feelings of revenge or of charity, of cruelty or of kindness, will give the tone and complexion to their penal legislation. And nothing, perhaps, serves more fully to mark the present progress of society, than the gradual and judicious reforms that are going on in this system. The policy that grew up in a darker age, and received its principal elements from ruder times, is passing away. The divine is advancing; the demoniac is receding. The Christian is taking the place of the savage; and the hope now is, that the latter may not long find room to spread his blanket. At least, he who believes in any thing higher and greater than Satan, will not only hope, but labor, in faith and love, to this end.

The death-penalty belongs, at best, to a state of barbarism; and however fitting it may be in that condition, it seems entirely out of place in the present stage of civilization. Before I consider directly, however, its objectionable character, I wish to offer a few suggestions, that my ground of opposition may not be mistaken.

Digitized by Google

1. In the first place, I have never been fully satisfied of the absolute inviolability of human life. I am not convinced that it is impossible for a state of things to exist, in which it would be right for man to take the life of his brother man. No one, believing the divine history, will deny that there was a time when the best good of society demanded this penalty. Otherwise, we can hardly suppose that God would have then ordained it. And unless he has plainly and positively prohibited it since, there would seem to be a *possibility* still remaining, of its justice and propriety. True, it has been denied that any one but the Almighty is authorized to assume its necessity; but, in the absence of all specific directions from him, I think we have full liberty to decide the question for ourselves. And though I acknowledge that he has once given it as a law to man, and, as I believe, has since abrogated that law, yet I have never found, in the Christian code, any declaration that clearly and directly forbids its infliction. Indeed there is but one argument which I have ever seen, of any apparent force, to show that society could have no rightful power over human life, under any possible circumstances; and that, I must confess, is not entirely satisfactory. The argument is briefly this: "The powers of society are made up of contributions from its individual members. It can, therefore, have no just authority beyond this. And, as no man has a right to take his own life, no one can confer this right on society. It is, therefore, under all circumstances, unless divinely commanded, an authority wholly unjustifiable." The reasoning appears cogent; but I am not satisfied that the premises are all strictly true. Is there not clearly an important sense in which men have power over their own lives? Did not He, from whom we take our highest laws, affirm that whosoever would be His disciple, must love Him better than his own life even? Did He not send out His early teachers, knowing right well that some of them must sacrifice their lives in proclaiming His gospel? Did not one of the most celebrated of these declare that he counted not his life dear in view of the work given him to do? These facts seem to show, that life here is not the highest good; that there is that which ought to be dearer to us than life itself; that there are great truths to be dissem-

Digitized by Google

inated, great principles to be maintained; truths and principles, to the prevalence of which, even human life should be subordinate. So thought Christian martyrs, and we venerate their fidelity.

I wish not to strain this argument in the least degree. I only say that humanity has interests which ought to be paramount in every mind, and for which a greater than man did not hesitate to die. When these interests are at stake, and a crisis of affairs comes up, that, in the clear light of duty, seems to demand it, I believe that the good man has a rightful power over his own life, and may give it freely and justly. In contending, therefore, against the death-penalty, let it not be inferred that I am attaching a false estimate to human life, or assuming it to be more sacred and valuable than any and every thing else.

2. In the second place, let it be understood, also, that I oppose this penalty from no morbid sensibility, which cannot submit to the infliction of necessary pain. No; if it can be shown that a necessity exists for a doom of this character,—a necessity based either in the commands of God, or in the best interests of society,—however revolting it may appear, I will yield to it as readily as I would give a diseased limb to the knife of the surgeon. I do not shrink at the idea of great suffering even, if there are interests to be secured of sufficient importance to demand it. I see, far back in the ages, sad sights: the earth crimsoned with the blood of men, whole cities swept by wars, devoured by famine, wasted by pestilence; some burned with fire rained down from heaven; at one time, indeed, the whole world, save one family, buried by the deluge as if under the waters of the ocean; and though the sight is painful, still, I feel that it was all right and proper, because ordered by infinite wisdom. God, in his far-reaching counsels, saw a necessity for all this wretchedness; and doubtless, it was as harmonious with his goodness, as called for by his wise purposes. In this light, all the misery that has ever been endured on earth, becomes reconciled with my sympathies. There is somewhere existing a necessity for it all. Far, very far, it may be, beyond the reach of our vision; and yet, so sure as there is a Sovereign on the throne of the universe, all this is demanded by his infinite perfections. Before such a

Digitized by Google

necessity, it becomes us to bow implicitly. And whenever it can be made to appear clearly that the divine authority requires it, or that human welfare demands it, I am not only ready to sanction the death-penalty, but will plead for it and defend it; or I will go out and see the criminal choked to death, as submissively as I would witness the death-struggle of the good man who dies in the arms of his friends. It is, therefore, as I have stated, no morbid sensibility, nor horror at the idea of suffering alone, that leads me to oppose the death-penalty.

3. In the third place, I would remark, that it is not mere sympathy for the criminal, which excites hostility to this peculiar penalty, in my own mind. Let it not be understood, however, that I would cherish no sympathy for him, even for the vilest that ever lived. The single reflection that the most guilty is a partaker of the same humanity with ourselves; that the temptation under which he has fallen, might have crushed us had we been assailed under similar circumstances; that did we know familiarly his whole history, we should find a thousand things to excite interest in his fate; ought to be enough to arouse a sympathy as deep as the soul can feel. Still, I say, it is not alone on this account that I oppose the taking of the criminal's life. Human laws may put him in a dungeon, shut him out from his friends and the light of heaven, give him bread and water for his food, and the cold stone floor for his resting-place; they may doom him to wear out life in that miserable state of loneliness and destitution; or they may take him out and end all his earthly woes at once, by the axe or the halter; and so far as his sufferings are concerned, I should think there could be little choice in these penalties. Some who have forfeited their lives by their crimes, have, doubtless, been rejoiced when this penalty was exchanged for perpetual imprisonment;[1] and others[2] I have known, who affirmed with apparent sincerity, that they would much rather end life at once, than wear it out in so wretched a solitude. Indeed, there is little reason to doubt that there are some bold and daring criminals,

[1] This was said to be the case with Van Steenburg and O'Connor, the anti-renters recently convicted in the State of New York.

[2] Babe, the pirate, imprisoned in New York city, is said to prefer death to perpetual imprisonment.

Digitized by Google

who would gladly escape the long agonies of perpetual bondage, by the quick work of the hangman; and others, too, there may be, who have that nervous dread of death, which would impel them to brave all the horrors of life-bondage, could they lengthen thereby the brief period that separates them from the grave. Perhaps, after all, we ought to remember that the penalty society inflicts, is but a small part of what the criminal suffers. His bitterest pangs, doubtless, are those that human laws can neither impose nor save him from. But considering only the forms of punishment which society can inflict, I find little more to excite my sympathies for the criminal, in the axe and the halter, than in the weariness and heart-sickness of solitary life-bondage. And though I consider the latter far preferable as a penalty, for reasons which I shall by and by offer, it is not a desire to screen the criminal from punishment, that forms any part of these reasons. If the law and its penalty are founded in perfect justice, and there can be no doubt of the guilt of the criminal, I would not lift a finger to save him from the blow of retribution, though my heart might be pained to see that blow inflicted. I know very well that the highest possible love in the universe, has ordained retributive suffering as a material portion of its own all-perfect economy; and though the reasons of that ordination may be beyond the reach of my vision, yet am I confident of its justice, and of its harmony with the most glorious moral perfection. Under the divine administration, I do not shrink at the idea of suffering for even the good man, or the innocent little child; why should I in the case of the criminal?

4. In the fourth place, let me add, that I do not oppose the death-penalty from a one-eyed charity; a charity that regards only the criminal, while it overlooks every body and every thing else. This is an error into which even a good man is very liable to fall; a man who has a keen sensibility and ardent feelings, and who is accustomed to act more perhaps from his impulses than from sober reason. Such action may be very well, if a child is to be saved from the fire, or a friend from the water; but it will hardly answer in cases that admit of deliberation. True charity, while it does not overlook the criminal, regards, also, each member, as well as the great body, of society. It is not

Digitized by Google

moved too much by passion or prejudice, but consults the great interests of humanity, in dealing with the individual. I would suggest the inquiry, here, whether among the friends and the foes of the gallows, there is sufficient care in regard to this matter. The age is one of great activity. We live in much excitement; and is not action becoming, on all hands, too much the fruit of passion or impulse; too little the result of calm, sober thought? A criminal is thrown before the public, and two parties immediately appear. The one is loud and clamorous for his blood. Nothing short of this will answer its purpose. Its members will go miles, in storm or in sunshine, on foot or on crutches, to see a poor wretch swing from the gallows; and perhaps burn the executive in effigy, if he interposes a pardon, and cheats them of the anticipated enjoyment. I submit the query, how much of this clamor for human blood arises from a clear and calm conviction of its necessity; and how much of it is the result of a low spirit of vengeance, as detestable as it is ill-concealed. The other party takes opposite ground. It sees only the guilty convict, crushed with shame and overwhelmed with anguish. It sees the keen edge of the sword of retribution. Its members become powerfully excited. The deep fountains of their sympathies are stirred to the very bottom, and they rush forward with all their energies to save him from his doom. Have they ever cast an eye beyond this scene of wo? Have they asked, deliberately, whether they were removing the shield from the innocent; whether crime would take courage from the issue; whether society would be more defenceless, or the great interests of humanity suffer in the end? How much, then, of this zeal for the criminal is the fruit of a one-eyed charity; and how much of it comes from a broad rational survey, that has enforced a conviction of its propriety?

Let it be distinctly understood, therefore, and carried along through the remainder of this discussion, that on none of these grounds am I moved to reject and oppose the death-penalty. It is not from a belief that human life must be preserved at any cost. It is not from a morbid sensibility that cannot sanction the infliction of necessary pain. It is not from a desire to screen the criminal improperly; nor is it from a one-eyed charity, that cannot consider the great interests of society.

Digitized by Google

I oppose it, because I deem it peculiarly a barbarous penalty; because its influence on the public morals is exceedingly corrupting, (partly confessed to be so, by many of the States that forbid executions to be public;) inflaming all that is ferocious in human nature, and directly exciting to deeds of blood; because that it has signally failed to answer the purpose of just criminal legislation, namely, the benefit of all the members of society, including the criminal as well as the body to which he belongs; and, in short, because, for these and various other reasons, there is no existing necessity for it, either in the present laws of God, or in the true interests of humanity.

This latter position, I shall attempt to sustain as well as I am able, in the space now left me. I claim that this penalty is unrighteous, unless there be clearly shown a necessity that now demands it. I care not, so far as this question is concerned, what reasons may have existed for it in ages long since passed away; or in fact, what reasons may exist for it, now, among Turks, Arabs, or savages. Not to these do I address myself, but to professing Christians of the nineteenth century. And if there is any ground of necessity for this penalty, now existing, among civilized and Christian people, I demand that such ground shall be clearly and distinctly stated. Too long has this been maintained by bold and arrogant assumption. It is time that we had something like tangible facts to support it. In a question so purely practical, one that can be so easily tested and settled by fair experiment, I have a right to demand this evidence. It is hardly enough to say, in reply, as the multitude are apt to say, We have always had the gallows, and cannot do without it. We have always had cut-throats, too, and pick-pockets; yet I think we could manage to do without them. Nor is it sufficient to say, as some have said, that crimes are committed even with the gallows staring the criminal in the face; and therefore it must be unsafe to cut it down. This reminds me of the logic of the celebrated Dr. Ollapod. He had invented a curious pill, under the operation of which his patients were dying off, at wholesale. His friends finally remonstrated, and begged him to try some other prescription. But he replied, with all gravity, that he had used the medicine for many years, and that if they died *with*

Digitized by Google

it, what in the world would they do *without* it? I assure those who urge this plea for the gallows, that they are only battering down their own fortification. If crime continues to prevail, and is often committed, indeed, at the very foot of the gallows, and before the body of its victim is fairly cold, it only proves that this engine of terror utterly fails of its object, and ought, therefore, to give way for a fair trial, at least, of something which may prove to be better.

No common pleas, like these, should stand for a moment as the basis of such an institution. It must stand, if it stands at all, because there is a *necessity* that demands it. And the *ground* of this necessity, if it exists, must be found either in some divine authority now binding, or in the true interests of society. I will give each of these grounds a brief review.

I. Is this penalty demanded by any existing divine authority? This is the stronghold of its supporters. They claim that certain divine laws, now binding, require it; and, in fact, that God has ordained it as a perpetual institution. The argument of the Rev. Mr. Cheever, of New York, whose work is now the text-book of the better part of those who defend capital punishment, stands almost wholly on this ground. It was shrewdly done; for he well knew that the feeling in our religious community would allow no institution to be condemned, on which even a shadow of God's approbation could be supposed to rest. The divine authority which he claims for this penalty, is chiefly summed up in a single declaration, connected with the covenant made with Noah immediately after the deluge. "Whoso sheddeth man's blood, by man shall his blood be shed."—(Gen. ix. 6.) This is the corner-stone of his entire argument. In the Mosaic dispensation, which was given more than *eight hundred* years afterward, and which we know annexed this penalty to a great number of crimes, he seems not to attempt to find much support. Two prominent reasons, at least, served to prevent it. 1. That was evidently a national code, and never designed to be general or permanent; and, 2. To make that dispensation authoritative now, would be fatal, inasmuch as it would visit this penalty on a vast number of deeds, some of which are now deemed comparatively trivial, and others,

Digitized by Google

no crimes at all. Accordingly, he passes over the Mosaic dispensation, and goes back to the covenant made with Noah. He maintains that this individual, from whom the postdiluvian world was peopled, stood at the head of all after ages and nations, as a kind of representative; that this command, to take the life of the murderer, being given to him under these circumstances, must have been designed for universal and perpetual obligation. This is the narrow point from which he rears his whole superstructure.

To this position, I have two replies to make; either of which is fatal to its validity. Waiving all inquiries into the true rendering of this famous text, I will consider it, as it is claimed to be, a literal command to take the murderer's life. There were, it should be remembered, two distinct commands given to Noah, at this time; one recorded in the fourth and fifth verses, and the other, already quoted, in the sixth verse, of this chapter. Both are given at the same period, and are of such a character, as evidently to impose equal obligations. The first affirms that, although every beast and fowl were given to be used for food by man, yet *the blood* of these should not be eaten. And God assures Noah, that he would require this blood at the hand of man, as fully as he would human blood. Then follows the second command, on which its friends base the death-penalty. Now, it is plain, that if either of these commandments, (admitting them to be such,) is of perpetual obligation, both must be. In this respect, both stand on the same basis, and if the latter is binding now, then the former must be also.

It will be seen, at once, in what light this fact places our attorney for the gallows, and his friends. They love a plump fowl as well as any one, and would not object to a hare, though both were strangled and dressed with the blood in them. And when they sit down to a dinner of roast-beef, few of them object seriously to have the blood follow the carving-knife. And yet, these are the men who have so much devout respect for the old Noachic dispensation! men who will clamor for the life of a wretched criminal, because, as they affirm, that dispensation demands it; and who still will not hesitate to trample on another of its injunctions, every day of their lives, for the sake of a pleasant dinner! I feel justified, then, in holding them to this issue. Either shall they give up all authority

Digitized by Google

for the gallows based upon the command to Noah, or they shall confess the same allegiance to the other commandment, and prepare to meet the consequences,—be hanged for their past violations. Or, (still supposing this to be a literal command, in which form only can it have any binding authority over us,) let them carry out fully, in all cases, the requisition to shed the blood of *every* man who has ever shed human blood. No matter how it was done, accidentally, designedly, *legally*, or otherwise; "Whoso sheddeth man's blood," in any way, "by man shall his blood be shed." Let this be done, as the very Orthodox interpreters of this passage are bound to do it, and who cannot see that it is impossible for the slaughter to end short of the suicide of the last man on earth?

But I have another reply to this argument. It grows out of the plain fact that where there is the least apparent antagonism in the divine commandments, the *last* given must invariably take precedence in point of authority. God, in giving his requisitions, evidently adapts them to the peculiar condition and circumstances of his creatures. Specific commands are given at particular times to meet some peculiar exigency that may exist, and they are never intended to be observed after the reasons that demanded them have passed away. A fact, so evident, and so generally admitted, even Mr. Cheever does not attempt to deny; but, conceding this, he still endeavors to avail himself of the authority of this command given to Noah, in support of the death-penalty, by claiming that the same reasons which existed for it then, exist for it now. His proof of this, rests on an expression that immediately follows the command in the sixth verse; "Whoso sheddeth man's blood, by man shall his blood be shed; *for in the image of God made he man.*" He maintains that, in this closing expression we have assigned the *reason* for taking the life of the murderer; and this reason, still continuing, renders it imperative that the same penalty should be inflicted now.

To strip the sophistry from this argument, it is only necessary to observe that the fact here stated, namely, that man was made in God's image, is by no means brought forward as a reason for *taking the murderer's life;* for there is no connection between this fact and the sequence.

Digitized by Google

To say that man is made in the image of God; *therefore* we must *kill* a criminal,—is absurd. It pretends to assign, as a reason *for* killing a man, a fact which, in itself, would seem plainly to imply the very reverse. Man is made in the divine image, and we ought not to mar that image, even to punish a criminal; this would seem to be better logic. For what, then, is this fact appended to the command? Evidently, not to show what *kind* of punishment should be inflicted upon the criminal; but to exhibit the peculiarly *sacred character* of human life; and to show that it ought to be *preserved* as sacredly as possible. The plain sequence of the declaration is, life should be *saved*, not *destroyed*. This evidently embraces its whole force, and renders its sense consistent. We see, at once, a plain connection between the *reason* assigned, and the *fact* it is brought to support. If God made man in his own image, then, to take life is to mar that image. This should be avoided; and, as life is so very sacred, it should never be sacrificed to any thing short of an imperative necessity.

But if this is the true sense of the passage, how is it consistent with the command to take the murderer's life? Simply, because at that time, and under the circumstances then existing, human life could be more *generally preserved* by the death of the criminal, than in any other manner. At least, all that can be obtained from this passage is simply the fact, that God saw this penalty to be preferable at that period.

But before this can be urged as sufficient authority for its infliction, *now*, the question must be considered, What communication have we had in regard to this subject since? Has there been no revision of this divine statute by the great Lawgiver? If any commands have been subsequently received, touching this matter, of course they must take precedence in point of authority over us. If it be thought that an infinite and perfect Being would not command at one time, and countermand at another; it is fortunate that we have an instance of this kind, the force of which cannot be questioned. I refer to the well-known case of Abraham; in which, at one time, he was solemnly commanded to go out and offer up his son Isaac; and afterwards as solemnly commanded not to do it. No Christian will deny that it was his duty to obey the first

Digitized by Google

command so long as it remained in force; but when the countermand was received, it was equally his duty to obey that. Such was the course he actually pursued in both cases; and I hardly need to add, that it won for him the special approbation of the Most High.

With the light of this fact before us, I contend that, as *Christians*, we have nothing to do with laws and commandments that were given to Noah, or to the Jews, any farther than these are found to be sustained by, or in harmony with, the instructions contained in the last great dispensation given to us through Christ. Whatever these elder covenants and dispensations may reveal as *facts*, I gratefully accept as such; but when a question of moral right or duty arises, I go not to them for an answer. In regard to all matters of this kind, I acknowledge no master but Jesus Christ; no divine authority that is inconsistent with his teachings. The commandment given to Noah, and the judicial system furnished to the Jews through Moses, demanded the death-penalty for a great number of offences; but this fact goes not one step toward extending their divine authority over us, unless they are shown to be harmonious with the spirit and requisitions of Christianity.

If this penalty is still maintained, and any authority is claimed for it, beyond mere human opinion, it must be found in the gospel of Jesus Christ. Can it find any true basis here? Does Christ command it, or approve it? Or does he directly or virtually prohibit it? I will frankly state, what I have more than hinted in the beginning, that though I find in the gospel dispensation no sanction of this penalty, I can also discover no direct and distinct prohibition in regard to it. I do not believe that the teachings of Christ, if properly understood, will admit of its infliction; but simply because the condition of society does not demand it. Did the real wants of a Christian community create a *necessity* for its institution, I believe that the Christian religion could not be understood as forbidding it. Christ was no special legislator. He gave us no detailed judicial code; and chiefly, as I believe, for this reason, namely, the details of a wisely constructed judicial system will always be adapted to the peculiar circumstances that demand them. These circumstances may

Digitized by Google

vary widely, among different nations, at different times, and in different conditions of society. To meet these varied wants, a judicial system must vary its details. The modes and forms of punishment may differ, while the great principles on which it is based remain ever the same. For example: that code of laws, with its pains and penalties, which would be best adapted, in detail, to the inhabitants of a New England State, might not be found equally appropriate in Spain or Italy. And Christ's religion, designed as it evidently was to cover the broad face of the earth, and to take in all ranks and conditions of society, rendered authoritative only that which was equally adapted to all; namely, certain great *principles* which must form the basis of all just penal legislation, as well as all proper action. Christ never told us that we should *fine* a criminal, or *imprison* one, or *whip*, or *banish*, or *hang* one. Nor has he told us that we shall not do any or all of these, if an application of his principles and of his spirit to the condition of society demand it. These principles, and this spirit, are alike for all ages and nations. They are founded, not alone in the divine will, but in the very nature and constitution of things. But if we are to determine whether any sanction can be found, here, for the death-penalty, we must have a definite idea of what these principles and this spirit are. Perhaps the expression, which will best unite the views of all Christians, in regard to this particular, is something like the following: All Christ's commandments having reference to the duties men owe to each other, are resolved into the great central principle, or, as it is usually denominated, "the law of love." This I believe is everywhere conceded. Now, if the true and proper exercise of this law of love, really demands the life of the criminal, the whole question, with me, is at once settled. If this fact can possibly be made to appear, then there is now existing a divine authority for this penalty, that cannot be evaded. But if this fact cannot be shown; if, as I believe, the legitimate exercise of this great Christian principle will not permit its infliction in the present condition of society, then there is no divine authority for it, now binding upon us. How is the fact?

This law of love, as I understand it, is not to be exercised in reference to society alone, with no regard to the

Digitized by Google

good of the criminal. It is not to be exercised toward the criminal alone, regardless of the good of society. The true interests of both parties must be sought, as far as practicable. Christ does not command us to love the innocent, and not the guilty; nor does he command us to love the guilty, and not the innocent. To do either, would be wrong. And that kind of legislation which regards the interests of either party *alone*, cannot be based upon the principles or spirit of Christ. He commands the exercise of this law of love toward *all* men; that the true interests of each and all shall be as equally consulted as they can be. If I am correct here, then it follows, that the *kind* of punishment which will best serve to protect the innocent, and at the same time secure, if possible, the restoration of the guilty, is the best kind, and the one dictated by the gospel of Christ. This takes the subject out of the class of positive ordinances, and leaves us to decide the question for ourselves, by a correct application of the principles and spirit of Christ to the present condition of society. The final decision, therefore, must turn on the bare question of *expediency* in regard to these considerations. The entire discussion, it appears to me, must be narrowed down to this point at last.

In a clear view, then, of all the facts in the case, and in the light of all the experience we have and can have, Is this penalty *necessary?* Do the best interests of society, embracing, of course, a due regard to those of the criminal, really demand it? On the answer to this question, the death-penalty must stand or fall.

We have only to consider, now, 1. Its bearing upon the true good of society; and, 2. Its bearing upon the criminal.

Waiving for a moment, all claims that the criminal may have on our consideration, is this penalty demanded by the welfare of society? I think that it might be shown by a fair process of reasoning that there is no necessity for it, on this ground. Arguments, drawn from general principles alone, might be sufficient to convince most men that some other form of punishment, say perpetual imprisonment under proper regulations, would give a higher degree of safety to the interests of society, than can be secured by the infliction of death. But this is not necessary. It is

Digitized by Google

not, as I have suggested, a question of mere theory, to be decided by logic. It is purely a *practical* question. It is to be decided by fair experiment only; and I have a right to claim that this test shall be applied to it. Society has no authority to *assume* its necessity, as it has generally done hitherto. It has no right to *begin* by killing the criminal, on a mere Yankee "*guess*" that it cannot protect itself without. If this course of practice be admitted, then it would seem that the principle ought to be carried through. It should be adopted in every judicial process; the gallows should be set up for the smallest offence; and if any one questions its propriety, close his mouth with the assumption that nothing else will answer. If he persists in thinking some other penalty preferable, call upon him for proof; but be careful, at the same time, to hold on to the gallows, and thus deprive him of the only means of proving his suggestion by experiment! This is precisely the manner in which the advocates of the death-penalty have proceeded; and it is only in this manner, that this penalty is now retained to disgrace our statute-books and our religion. No one pretends that any substitute has ever been tried, with us; and until this is done, common sense must see that it stands on nothing better than wilful assumption.

Now, the plainest dictates of reason and justice demand a course of action wholly the reverse. Instead of *commencing* with the sacrifice of the criminal,—the very worst thing it can do to him, and then *assuming* that nothing else will answer for its own security, society should begin with the mildest form of punishment that may reasonably be deemed efficient, and then increase it, if at all, only as it is forced to do so by the necessity of the case. This is not a new, or strange, or unreasonable demand. It is only requiring of society precisely the same thing that society requires of every individual. Society does not allow the individual to take life in self-defence even, until driven to it from absolute necessity. It demands that he shall be attacked and driven to the wall, with no apparent means left of escape, before he shall strike the fatal defensive blow. It is fully justified in demanding this. It proceeds upon what it supposes to be a true principle, namely, that life shall be taken only as a *last resort of defence.*

Digitized by Google

Taking, then, its own position, a position approved by its highest jurists, I ask society to adopt this principle, and carry it out fairly, in reference to judicial killing. If it will do this, I am satisfied. Let it adopt perpetual imprisonment, under judicious regulations, as a substitute for taking life; give this a thorough trial for a sufficient length of time; and then, if it is found, by experiment, that society cannot protect itself equally well, and better, indeed, than it does now; if its interests are found to demand a return to the death-penalty, there will seem to be some rational basis for that penalty to stand upon. Never, till then, has any one a right to assume its necessity; and never, till then, will the lips of those who ask for its abolition be sealed up.

This argument, it seems to me, ought to be conclusive, so far as this subject relates to the interests and protection of society. However, to satisfy the most skeptical, the fearful and doubting conservative, that this is no very hazardous experiment, let me add, that it is not now to be made for the first time. It has been already successfully tried, by different governments, and in various conditions of society, doubtless more unfavorable than our own, to a happy result. The reader is now most earnestly entreated to consider the experiment and its results, as they have been exhibited in several countries, and in different ages.

1. The Experiment in Rome.[1] For two hundred and fifty years, the Roman republic flourished, with this penalty expressly forbidden by its statutes. A very few exceptions, however, are noticed, in which criminals were put to death. In the case of the Catalinarian conspirators, and of the tyrant Manlius, the former were put to death by Cicero, and the latter precipitated from the Tarpeian rock. That the death of the former was illegal, is seen in the banishment of Cicero for the act; and whether the latter was allowed by the statute, or whether it was inflicted by public opinion overstepping the law in an aggravated case, I am unable to determine. At any rate, the death-penalty,

[1] To avoid frequent references, let me say, once for all, that the authorities quoted here are taken from the admirable work on Capital Punishment, by the Rev. Charles Spear. See also the profound Report of J. L. O'Sullivan, Esq., of New York. Also Democratic Review, March and April, 1843.

Digitized by Google

it would seem, was not considered during that period either legal or desirable, with perhaps some slight exceptions of this character.

THE RESULT. "The republic was not the worse regulated, and no injury was done to the police."—*Montesquieu.* "In this period the republic flourished; under the emperors, severe punishments revived, and then the empire fell." — *Blackstone.*

2. THE EXPERIMENT IN RUSSIA. An hundred years ago, the Empress Elizabeth abolished the death-penalty throughout her dominions. "If," said she, "I can show that, in the ordinary state of society, the death of a citizen is neither useful nor necessary, I shall have pleaded the cause of humanity with success." For twenty years she maintained her pledge never to inflict this punishment. And in the long period since, it has been resorted to barely on *two* rare and extraordinary occasions! To the Empress Catharine, a French ambassador attributes the noble declaration, "We must punish crime without imitating it. The punishment of death is rarely any thing but a useless barbarity." Such has been the condition of that vast empire for an entire century.

THE RESULT. "Experience demonstrates that the frequent repetition of capital punishment, never yet made men better."—*Elizabeth.* "The Count de Segur, on his return from his embassy at St. Petersburg, in a letter published in the *Moniteur*, in June, 1791, declared that Russia, under the operation of this law, was one of the countries in which the least number of murders was committed." Russian representatives in this country, bear a similar testimony. They state, "that all the intelligent public opinion there, is perfectly settled on this subject; no one thinking of returning to the death-punishment." Well does Dobell exclaim: "Blush! ye countries of a longer civilization, that Russia should teach you the celestial principle of reforming depraved morals, not by the sanguinary execution of inexorable justice, but by the mild and divine precepts of heavenly mercy."

3. THE EXPERIMENT IN BOMBAY. The excellent Sir James Mackintosh, while governor here, totally abolished the death-penalty, and ruled 200,000 people, many of whom were soldiers, for seven years, without resort to it in a single instance.

Digitized by Google

THE RESULT. This he states himself to be highly favorable to his mild policy. He gives statistics in his farewell charge to the grand jury, showing that, at a former period, when capital punishments were inflicted, — a period in which the amount of population and other circumstances were more favorable to good order, — the murders were very nearly "as *three to one*," to those committed during its abolition under his government! "This experiment has, therefore," he adds, "been made without any diminution of the security of the lives and property of men. If any experience has been acquired, it has been safely and innocently gained."

4. THE EXPERIMENT IN BELGIUM. The death-penalty has been practically abolished in Belgium for nearly seventeen years. I can give no information that seems to indicate that the condition of society in its "seven provinces," was more favorable to the trial during this time, than previously, except as it became so from the influence of its gentler government.

THE RESULT. "M. Ducpetiaux, the inspector-general of prisons," gives this, in the following table. For nineteen years previous to 1814, there were twenty-one murders *per annum*, and 533 executions. For fifteen years following, eight murders *per annum*, and seventy-two executions. For five years subsequent, four murders *per annum*, with the death-penalty abolished!

Is there no safety, then, but in implements of death? Does the security of life, and of the welfare of society, still demand the code of blood?

5. THE EXPERIMENT IN TUSCANY. Particular attention is asked to the experiment here, because its results have been evidently misrepresented,—I wish I could say, *ignorantly;* but let that pass. Near eighty years ago, the Grand Duke Leopold ascended the throne of that state. He had for his counsellor, Beccaria, one of the most enlightened ministers and Christian philanthropists of the age. He held that "the redress of grievances," and "the correction of the delinquent," were "proper objects of punishment." He began, therefore, a reform of the penal code of the state; and as he believed that the amendment of the criminal "ought never to be abandoned in despair," he abolished the punishment of death throughout his

Digitized by Google

dominions. This state of things continued for twenty-five years, or more, when the death-penalty was again resorted to, and reëstablished by law. This was believed to furnish a rare opportunity for triumph to the friends of the gallows. And the appeals that have been made to it, by Dr. Baird and the Rev. Mr. Cheever, show how greedily it has been seized upon for this purpose. The Hangman, published in Boston, by the Rev. Mr. Spear, quotes the former, as saying, that "during its abolition, murders increased to so alarming an extent, that the government was obliged to adopt capital punishment again!" The latter is charged, on the same authority, with saying, that "the experiment proved so unsatisfactory, that the government restored the penalty of death!" Can it be possible that these gentlemen were no better informed? Or can religious prejudice so blind the eyes of men to truth? What are the facts of the case?

The Result. "M. Berenger, in a report made to the French chamber of deputies, in 1830, says that the punishment of death was abolished during a period of twenty-five years in Tuscany, and the mildness of the penal legislation had so improved the character of the people there, that there was a time when the prisons of the grand duchy *were found entirely empty!*" Mr. Livingston says, "that in Tuscany, where murder was not punished with death, only five had been committed in twenty years; while in Rome, where that punishment is inflicted with great pomp and parade, *sixty* murders were committed in the short space of three months, in the city and vicinity!" The statement of the grand duke himself, it would seem, ought to be sufficient confirmation, if any were needed. He is represented as saying, after a trial of the experiment: "With the utmost satisfaction to our paternal feelings, we have at length perceived that the mitigation of punishment, joined to a most scrupulous attention to prevent crimes, and also a great despatch in the trials, together with the certainty of punishment to real delinquents, has, instead of increasing the number of crimes, considerably *diminished* that of smaller ones, and rendered those of an atrocious nature *very rare*."

The very natural query here arises: If such were, in reality, the fruits of its abolition, why was the death-penalty

Digitized by Google

ever restored? If crime did not increase to demand it, as it is stated by Messrs. Cheever and Baird, and denied by those who know the facts, how, and for what reason, was it ever resorted to again? "It was restored," says Mr. Livingston, "because an enlightened and humane sovereign was succeeded by a foreign conqueror." It was because the wisdom of Beccaria, and the paternal kindness of Leopold, were displaced by the rapacity and blood-thirstiness of *Napoleon!* It was chiefly by the will of that man, who was instrumental in murdering, according to the very Christian laws of war, some six millions of our race, that the death-penalty was reëstablished in Tuscany, at the time of the French conquest. Fit man for such a work! Louis Bonaparte, who refused the throne of Tuscany, under his brother's authority, because he could not be allowed sufficient control of its internal regulations, exposes, in a work issued at Paris, the policy of the emperor in wishing to make the Tuscan government odious and cruel. "If I allowed you," says Napoleon, "to make Tuscany happy and tranquil, all travellers from France could envy it." "The interest of France is the point to which every thing must tend, — codes, taxes and conscriptions, — every thing in your government must be to the profit of mine." Thus was the whole secret developed. The French government, with Napoleon at its head, must be glorified at any cost; and, that it might not suffer by contrast with Tuscan order and tranquillity, the mild laws of Leopold and Beccaria must give way to the code of blood! And this, too, according to M. Carmignani, "in opposition to the wishes of all the magistrates, to the views of all the enlightened jurists of the country, and to all the evidence which their recent experience has afforded." Most truly, if these facts can be relied on, are the advocates of the death-penalty welcome to the results of the experiment in Tuscany!

I ask, now, the rational and candid to consider well, what possible causes can exist here, in professedly enlightened and Christian New England, to demand the blood of the criminal, that did not operate in those communities which have refused to shed it for any wrong? Could Rome, Bombay, and Tuscany, formerly, or can Belgium and Russia, now, maintain a great degree of safety to life and property, without axe, halter, or hangman; and can

Digitized by Google

we not do it here? Shame to the men, who, to support a cruel religious creed, or for any other reason, will dare to pretend it! The conviction is forced upon me, that there is no conceivable reason for this barbarous penalty in our States, at the present day. The protection of society, and the best interests of humanity, regardless of the criminal, offer no ground on which a legal infliction of death can be justified.

II. Its bearing upon the criminal. A very few words here will answer. Every one must perceive that this penalty proceeds on the ground, that the criminal has no claims to be considered; that it gives him no opportunity for reformation, even if he is disposed to it, save the brief period which intervenes between the bar and the gallows; that it grants him nothing, but goes on at once to his irremediable sacrifice. In regard to this point, I have space to illustrate but a single ground of objection; and that has reference to the positive injustice that must result to the criminal, from its infliction.

1. It ought to be considered, that, in the commission of what are termed *capital* offences, as well as other wrongs, almost every shade of criminality is developed. Take, for example, the crime of wilful murder, which is punished by death in all our statutes. Common sense will show any one, that, in cases of this kind, there is an immense difference in the amount of guilt incurred by different offenders. While some murders are committed under circumstances that seem to evince the most malignant depravity; others have been known of such a character as to find, I had almost said, a sanction in the moral feelings of even a good man. Yet the law of "blood for blood," knows no difference in these cases, and would visit the death-penalty upon both alike, without the least discrimination whatever. Consider, as an example of one extreme, any of the numerous cases in which feeble and defenceless individuals have been coolly and savagely murdered, either for a few dollars, or, what is still more horrible, for the concealment of the foulest sensual crimes; murders, which from the utter baseness of the spirit that conceived them, and the aggravating circumstances that accompanied, must remain unparalleled in atrocity. Then, as a contrast, turn to one which occurred in Philadelphia, but a short time

Digitized by Google

ago. A young man, represented as of a noble disposition, though rash, had a sister that he loved as his own life. She was ruined—a ruin worse than death—by one of the gay, but foul wretches, who prey upon every populous community. The young man felt that no redress was to be obtained from the laws of the land. Human legislation had strangely neglected to provide a retribution for this villainy, though it would lay a heavy hand upon the poor man who should steal a six-penny loaf to keep his little ones from starving. He felt all this; and, goaded almost to distraction, he did what even a good man might be *tempted* to do,—went out, and shot down the wretch, as he would shoot a wild beast. I am, by no means, the apologist for that crime, beyond what truth and justice demand. With all its palliating circumstances, still it was murder, a gross offence against the laws of Him who has said, "Thou shalt not kill." But who will not acknowledge, in such a crime, and in many of the characters to which I have alluded, a world-wide difference as to the just deserts of the actors?

And in all cases falling between these two extremes, there must exist almost every possible shade of guilt. Still the code of blood makes no discrimination. Those who administer this code, may sometimes, in the more extreme cases, violate its provisions. The criminal young man in Philadelphia, was acquitted by acclamation; not *by* the law, but in *defiance* of it. Thus, some who are guilty escape all punishment from society, while others, without any reference to the enormity of their offences, are cut off alike.

It is plain, therefore, that so long as the death-penalty stands, much positive injustice must be done, from inability to vary its inflictions, so as to suit the different degrees of guilt in the criminal. With imprisonment as a penalty, this could be, at least, partially remedied. Under such an institution, the young man whom I have noticed, could have been punished proportionably to his crime; and the jury that tried him would not have felt compelled to choose between a penalty such as is inflicted upon the worst of criminals, and no punishment at all. They would probably have felt no hesitation in convicting him, had the legal penalty been at all consistent with what they believed to

Digitized by Google

be his true desert. And so in all other cases. The most aggravated instances of wrong could be visited with perpetual imprisonment in the most dreadful solitude, while all the less degrees of crime could be treated with a proportionate lenity. This would also make the most philanthropic and conscientious person feel free to take the office of juryman, and to convict even upon strong circumstantial evidence; and thus, a double advantage would be gained, in the *certainty* and *equity* of penal retribution. This would also admit of a judicious system of discipline, adapted to the condition of the offender, during the term of his confinement. The severity of imprisonment could be varied, under suitable regulations, to meet the penitence or impenitence of the convict; and thus the prisoner would not be thrown beyond the encouragement of hope.

2. In still another manner is the positive injustice of the death-penalty exhibited. I offer it in the words of the good La Fayette. "I shall ask for the abolition of the penalty of death," said he, "until I have the infallibility of human judgment demonstrated to me."

Good men and true men,—men perfectly innocent of the crimes charged upon them, have *often*, by a mysterious combination of circumstances, died upon the scaffold, by the axe, or the halter. I think I have somewhere seen numbered up about twenty or twenty-five cases of this kind, in which those who suffered were afterward proved to have been innocent; though my authority, and the precise number estimated, are both forgotten. No one will dispute, however, that many such instances have occurred; how many, God alone can tell. And let it be remembered, that so long as the death-penalty is permitted to stand, so long there will not only be a possibility, but a probability even, that such cases will be repeated. I well know the hesitation with which juries convict under the present laws, especially when the evidence is not of the most irresistible character; but I know equally well that cases have occurred where the *proof* of guilt seemed to be beyond the reach of *doubt*, and in which an innocent man has been given up to the hangman. An instance of this kind, said to have occurred in the city of New York, some years ago, was related to me while residing there. The circumstances were so strangely combined, as to force

Digitized by Google

the conviction upon the mind of almost every one conversant with them, that an individual was guilty of murder, for which he was executed, and whose innocence was finally announced in the death-bed confession of the murdered man's wife, who was thus shown to be the real criminal! Who can feel safe, under such a system of operations? Whatever may be one's condition, he must be in danger every moment.

Virtue is no sure protection; innocence is no certain shield. These may enable one to bear an unjust doom with fortitude perhaps, but they cannot exempt him from its liability for a single hour.

This great defect, however awful it may be, is not of a character that admits relief, so long as the code of blood continues. It is a radical evil. It belongs to that institution as a necessary appendage, and it cannot be remedied until that savage penalty is swept away. While it remains, the earth will drink the blood of the guiltless; a foul stain will rest upon their names, like leprosy, and be transmitted to their children; and all this without hope of alleviation! But, once remove that institution; and then, if men are convicted wrongly, as there is still a probability they will be, faith and hope and trust will be left to them; and they may go quietly to the dungeon, feeling that time with its revelations, may give them liberty and joy.

I regret to rest the argument here; however, I ought perhaps to do so. I trust that it has been shown, with sufficient clearness, that the death-penalty has no apparent ground to stand upon, either in any existing divine authority, or in the best interests of humanity. There is no necessity that demands it; but numberless facts and arguments that call loudly for its abolition. Their voices must and will be heard. The code of blood must pass away. Already there is a hand-writing upon it, that foretells its doom. A few more years will pass away, and consign it to its place among other relics of a darker age, where our children's children shall ponder over it, and wonder, in the light of a better day, how it could have existed so long.

M. B.

Digitized by Google

Art. X.

Uses of Evil.

In entering upon the subject involved in our title, we would express our deep sense of its great importance, and of the reverent and submissive feeling with which it should be approached. No one can feel more sensibly the many and serious difficulties with which it is burdened; and nothing can be farther from our thought than the expectation that all, or even the greater of these, will be removed from the field of inquiry by the present effort. The utmost to be looked for, is the gathering up, and bringing into clearer light, or at least the calling of a more patient and cheerful attention to, some considerations in connection with the existence of evil, which are apt to be overlooked; and which, more carefully weighed, might furnish some explanation of its uses; and help us, perhaps, to walk with a firmer step through the shadows which confessedly rest upon our path in this respect. And though an idle curiosity may justly be rebuked, no one, we think, will be disposed to condemn, without a hearing, any sincere effort to relieve the truly pious mind, and justify the ways of God to man.

It were to little purpose to inquire whether God could not have prevented the existence of what we call evil. It were better, since he has not prevented it, to devote what labor we give to the subject, to attempting to find some reason for its existence, and whether there be not some good use which it may subserve. God, for aught we know, might have made a world without evil in it. He might have made the inhabitants thereof perfect as the angels. For aught we know, he has done it somewhere in infinite space. But even if this could be demonstrated, it would still remain to be shown, that *this* world, and men, as we find them, imperfect and subject to evil, do not constitute a link in the chain of being, without which it would be incomplete; without which even heaven itself would lose a measure of its harmony and fulness. The philosophical poet has spoken wisely and well on this interesting point:

Digitized by Google

"Of systems possible, if 'tis confest
That wisdom infinite must form the best,
Where all must full or not coherent be,
And all that rises, rise in due degree;
Then, in the scale of reasoning life, 'tis plain,
There must be somewhere such a rank as man."

And then, in answer to that restless and complaining ambition, which would have man higher in the scale of being; which asks why he could not have been made perfect, or an angel, he proceeds:

"On superior powers
Were we to press, inferior might on ours;
Or in the full creation leave a void,
Where one step broken, the great scale's destroyed;
From Nature's chain whatever link you strike,
Tenth, or ten-thousandth, breaks the chain alike.
Let earth unbalanced from her orbit fly,
Planets and suns run lawless through the sky;
Let ruling angels from their spheres be hurled,
Being on being wrecked, and world on world;
And heaven's foundations to their centre nod,
And Nature trembles to the throne of God!"

Admitting, therefore, what no one, perhaps, is prepared to deny, that God *can* make a perfect world, or a world without evil, and people it with perfect beings; *this* world may, nevertheless, hold as important and necessary a place in creation as that. Nay, it may be that without just such a world as this, inhabited by just such beings, the whole machinery of the universe, as at present arranged, would be imperfect in its structure and working. Manifestly, this earth, with its myriad intelligences, is not formed without a purpose. Without them, the space which they fill in the circle of physical and moral existence, would be blank; and there would be one link wanting in the golden chain of being which stretches, on either side of us, to the infinite above, and the infinite below.

Let us, then, taking the world and man as we find them, make some effort to unfold the matter of our inquiry. And if we cannot solve the problem to our entire satisfaction, perhaps some light may be obtained which will make faith in the wisdom and benevolence of God, with regard to what we cannot know, less difficult; or, in other words, more cheerful and childlike.

If we do but consider what would be the condition of

Digitized by Google

the world in the absence of all that we call evil, we shall, perhaps, be somewhat surprised at the results of our thought. Keeping in mind, that we are to reason of the world as it is, and take man with his present constitution of mind and body, and his relations to the outward, physical universe — we shall hardly be prepared for the issues of our inquiry, if we have not been wont to look into the subject somewhat carefully.

At first glance, it seems to be a desirable and glorious thing, that there should be nothing of what we call evil in the world. We think it would be the perfection of our condition, and the crowning glory of our present life, if there were nothing to suffer, nothing to mar our comfort and enjoyment — if there were no sin, no error, no pain, no wrong. But after all, is not this a hasty conclusion, arrived at without investigation, or patient thought?

Constituted as the world and man are at present, if there were no evil in existence, the whole tide of action, it might almost be said, would be stopped in its onward flood; and the ever-heaving and rolling sea of life would be reduced to an unbroken calm, to a dead and stagnant level! This may seem to some, at first, a strange position, and it may not be wholly defensible; but it is believed some facts and truths may be offered in its support. The argument under this head we will call, for the sake of arrangement and distinction, the argument of activity.

I. The Argument of Activity or Action. It will be allowed without question, I think, that one great source of our happiness lies in activity — that one very large department of our present enjoyment is filled up by the continued development of our physical, intellectual and moral powers. But if there were no evil in the world, there would scarcely be occasion for activity, and there would be little room or opportunity for this development of the faculties. There would be, it is true, that activity and happiness which come of efforts to make an acquaintance with the character and works of God. There would be the happiness, also, which belongs to holiness of heart, to communion with God and with kindred spirits, the worth of which will be acknowledged of all. But still, with all this, it will be seen that there is yet a great

Digitized by Google

space left blank — that some of the noblest features of our nature are not brought into light; that some of the highest faculties of the soul are without their appropriate work. Let us see if there be not some truth in this.

1. *Physical Evils.* To begin with the lowest view of the subject. We have said that our happiness to a great extent — may we not say our highest happiness — lies in the perfect development of the physical, mental and spiritual powers. For accomplishing this, there must, of course, be occasion for that action of which this development is the legitimate result. But, if there were no evil connected with our present condition and estate, how could this be? Where the occasion for activity or exertion, if man were free from evil, and already as perfect as he is capable of being? And if you leave him one step this side of perfection, you involve him in the necessary evil of imperfection. But if perfect in all respects, what moving cause would there be for action? He has no wants to gratify; no enjoyment to obtain; no inconvenience to be rid of; no work to perform; no end to seek or gain; no occasion whatever for the slightest exertion of body or mind. The propelling power would be gone to a great degree, and life would become as a still and stagnant pool, covered over with its green and slimy coating, unbroken by the winds of heaven, or the dip of a passing wing.

If there were no hunger; if man had been so constituted as never to want food, then there would have been no room for the activity, both of mind and body, which is now devoted to procuring this. The noble science of agriculture, which is so rapidly unfolding the powers of the earth and the elements, and bringing us so constantly into the presence of infinite wisdom and benevolence, would have no being. The constant hum of business and enterprise heard all over the earth, and the wonderful and complicated movements connected with the supply of this one universal want, would cease at once. The far-stretching fields of grain, rich and ripe, waving in the wind, and adding such beauty to the landscape, and giving such joy to the heart of the beholder — the noble mill, with the noise of its grinding, and the wild merriment of its whirling wheels and rushing waters — the pleasant

Digitized by Google

garden-spot, with its various vegetable productions, and the satisfaction of cultivating and watching over it — the groves of delicious fruit, planted by the hand of man in every clime — the proud ship, that bears its freight of blessings from shore to shore — the canal, the railroad, the steam-ship, the magnetic telegraph, — all these would be struck out of existence; and the thousands who are engaged in these manifold employments, and find a life and joy in the activity they afford, would fall back into a dead silence and listlessness, and all would become a complete and thorough blank in the place of that quick life and cheerful industry, which are born of this want or evil, and those kindred to it.

And so follow out the catalogue of physical wants or evils, and behold to what results we come. Cold is an evil — many suffer from it greatly, and even perish of its severity. But if there were no cold or storm to provide against, where would be the need of shelter, or of fire? or of a large portion of the raiment now required? And without this want and the evil of it, you strike out another large measure of activity, and with it perish our dwellings, our towns and cities; and the millions who were just now full of life and action, and of the blessedness that comes of it, having no evils to provide against in this respect, having no more that they can do, sit down with folded arms, and *try* to be happy! But ah, if they remain the same beings, physically and mentally, they find it harder to be happy now than before.

And now, not to say any thing of the pleasure with which only the hungry man eats his bread; nor of the sweetness of the laboring man's sleep, or that rest which comes only of fatigue and toil — not to enter any farther into the category of physical evils, does not the little we have already seen show that, if this one class of evils were cast out from the world, all the energy and activity, all the physical development brought out in overcoming these, and all the happiness flowing from this activity and development, would also be cast out and destroyed? And this done, would not life, as we have said, be reduced, just in proportion, to a dull Dead Sea, whose slumberous waters never stir to the kiss of the zephyr, or leap up at the voice of the storm?

Digitized by Google

2. *Intellectual Evils, or the Evils of Ignorance.* In the general statement of the present argument, it was allowed, as an exception, that there might be, in the absence of evil, the action and happiness consequent upon efforts to increase our knowledge of God and his works. But was this exception even required? Does not the effort to increase our knowledge, presuppose ignorance and whatever evil there is associated with it? Assuredly so; for if we already were perfect in the knowledge of the character and works of Deity, there would be no room even for this degree of activity, nothing to call forth any movement to obtain what we already possessed.

That ignorance of the government and works of God, ignorance of the truths of science, of the laws of organized life, and of the physical universe, is the source of much evil, of accident and suffering, no one can, or is disposed to deny. But suppose there were no ignorance in regard to these things; suppose God had, when he created man, thoroughly instructed him in all the sciences; and imparted to him, by direct miracle or revelation, a complete knowledge of all the laws of the physical world. It is true you might in this way get quit of all the suffering, of all the evil consequent upon ignorance; but would you not also annihilate all the mental action and effort consequent upon it?

If the Creator had given to man in the beginning, by inspiration or revelation, a knowledge of all the sublime and beautiful truths of astronomy, chemistry, geology, physiology, political science, natural philosophy, and all other departments of human knowledge — then all the labor of mind, the splendid intellectual triumphs by which these truths have been unfolded, and which have thrilled all souls that have witnessed their success, with admiration and joy — all this activity and consequent happiness had never been. And we had not known, as now, how glorious a creature the human mind is; how manifold its powers and resources; how heroically it will struggle against difficulties, till it rise up into the heavens, victorious over all, and reverently, yet without trembling, stand at last in the presence of the Eternal One!

But not only this. With the loss of these efforts and triumphs, must be numbered also the countless books

Digitized by Google

written on these subjects; the glorious printing-press, giving wings to knowledge and truth; the beautiful and exquisite instruments with which science has wrought out her discoveries; and all the study and industry consequent upon them — all these must perish with the evils of ignorance; or rather, but for the evils of ignorance they could have had no existence. All the truths of science and art known to us, there would be no use for them — no call for mental effort to invent, or mechanical labor to execute.

Surely, then, it must be manifest that, without ignorance and its associated evil, we cannot have that energy and activity of mind and body, through which, it is confessed, must come, if it come at all, a large measure of our highest happiness. And it is clear, that if, from the beginning, God had struck out from the plan of creation, as it respects our world, the evil of ignorance, then over the splendid minds which have been engaged in noble and successful conflict with it, and have penetrated into some of the sublimest mysteries of nature; over the millions of other minds, that, by their triumphs, have been stirred to action and emulation — over all these must have settled a dead calm, unbroken by a single breath of labor or exertion!

If, then, there is any happiness in the discovery of truth, and the increase of knowledge; if any measure of our blessedness lies in the development and perfection of the intellect, all which necessarily involves the existence of previous ignorance and imperfection — then, just to this extent, we are furnished with a solution of the great problem of evil; or, at least, we see some of the important uses which evil may subserve.

3. *Moral Evil.* In entering upon this part of our argument, we feel that we are treading on what may, perhaps, be regarded as holy ground, and would fain take off the shoes from our feet, though we would still, reverently, walk forward. We are deeply sensible of the difficulties; yet something may be said, perhaps, to lighten the weight with which these press upon the devout and pious mind.

It was remarked, in allusion to this point, that if there were no moral evil in the world, nor the activity consequent upon it, we might, to be sure, enjoy the happiness of holiness and communion with God. But allowing

Digitized by Google

this, it will be seen here, also, that there is an extensive field not occupied by these. We shall show in another place that, without moral evil, there can scarce be any thing like positive moral virtue; that without wrong or offence, there can be no such thing as forgiveness, Christian charity, patience, the overcoming of evil with good, generosity, and self-sacrifice. But there is another view of the matter, deserving of some thought, which may be briefly noticed under this head.

If there had been no error or sin in the world, we should have known nothing of Jesus the Christ, that loftiest exhibition of perfected humanity, that single bright star in the mingled firmament of earth and heaven, whose light was never dimmed. We should have known nothing of his deeds of love and mercy in return for hate and cruelty; nothing of that life of his, always so serene and beautiful amid the storms of temptation and bigotry and persecution, and closed at last with that sublime prayer of forgiveness and blessing, the very record of which even now thrills the souls of the millions with unutterable emotions of reverence and joy. And so one of the most instructive pages in the history of humanity would have been left totally blank, with not a single bright word of heaven's language to catch the eye, or quicken the thought.

And of God, also — If there were no sin, we should lose sight of half the glory of his character, and of the beautiful and tender relations which he sustains to us. We should know him as a God of almighty power, of infinite wisdom, of perfect holiness; but of his saving grace, of his mercy, of his patient and watchful care for his wayward children, of his long-suffering and pardoning love, of his blessed promises of redemption — if there were no moral evil, no error nor sin, what should we know of these glorious exhibitions of the divine character? How could they have been at all? How could we have loved and adored, in spirit and understanding, the affectionate Father and the perfect God, as we love and adore him now?

Verily, but for the sin and disobedience which so darken the earth, but for the very evil we deplore, these displays of infinite mercy, these wonderful revelations of the divine perfections, would never have been called forth.

Digitized by Google

And so we should not have known how worthy God the Father is of our love, and of the highest reverence and the purest worship, which men and angels can render.

And now to sum up the present argument in few words. A large proportion of our present happiness lies in action, in the developing and perfecting our physical, intellectual, and religious natures; and this, as man is constituted in the present life, is to a great extent inseparably associated with, and dependent upon, physical, intellectual and religious or moral wants, otherwise called evils. Hence, if there were no such evil in the world, the whole tide of activity and consequent happiness would be checked in its onward flow; and the stirring scenes of cheerful industry which gladden and brighten the face of the earth, the noblest exhibitions of mind in the discoveries of science, the sublimest revelations of the divine character in the gospel, and some of the most beautiful examples of moral power and goodness as seen in the life of Jesus, and of other brave and true souls, these would never have had place in the world's history. And the multitude of all ages that have been quickened into new life by them, the whole mass of mind that has, through these influences, been lifted into action and blessedness, would have remained in a dull, indolent, and dreamless rest.

These considerations, we seriously believe, furnish some data towards an explanation of the existence of evil. Not that they remove all difficulty from our path, but that, this admitted, they still show that we should pause before we rashly arraign and condemn the thoughts and ways of God. With this we dismiss the argument to the reader's patient consideration, and proceed to another illustration of the subject.

II. The Argument of Contrast. It is an inquiry to which no careful thinker will hastily give a negative reply, whether we are not at present so constituted that it is impossible for us to receive what we call good continually, without any intervention of evil, and have it still retain all the elements of good, all the power of producing happiness. It is a question which cannot be answered at the asking, whether, under the present arrangement of things, blessings so called would not, by their very sameness and un-

Digitized by Google

interrupted succession, lose the characteristics of blessings; and, instead of being the source of pleasure, become themselves serious burdens? Let us look at this point a little.

Standing on the ground that man is a necessary link in the infinite chain of being, without whom there would confessedly be a break, then we think it may be safely said that the circumstances of his present life are necessary; that, constituted as he is, it were impossible for him to enjoy what we call good, if it were continual, and without contrast. The nerves of pleasure, so to speak, would be dulled, lose their delicate sensitiveness, and refuse to answer to the touch, from the frequency of their use.

Does not universal experience confirm this position? How soon the child tires of its playthings. How industriously, in the heat of summer, it will hunt the butterfly; but when caught, only a little while and the power to make happy with the one, and the power to be happy with the other, are alike exhausted. And now, though so delighted at first, if the child could have nothing but butterflies, how miserable it would be.

And how many find the experience of childhood in this respect, the experience of after years, also. How many devote the best portion of life to obtain what they promise themselves will constitute the perfection of blessedness; but, when the first burst of excitement and joy is over, find that their happiness is not half so happy, nor half so lasting as they anticipated. Ah, yes, how very many, after long toil and struggle, standing on the high places of their ambition, are ready to exclaim with the traveller at the sources of the Nile, "*And is this all!*" who, after a little while becoming familiar with their position, and the real worth of the honors and applause of the world; having looked again and again on all the loveliness of the landscape which spreads out around them, grow weary of all, and look back, with a wishful eye and a yearning heart, to the green groves and the humble valleys that lie sleeping in quiet and beauty far below them. The quick sense of pleasure is gone. The good has ceased to be good. The blessing no longer blesses. The object of ambition obtained, palls upon the appetite, and is rejected with loathing. And now, if they cannot come down from the eminence so long sought, and dwell in the quiet valley,

Digitized by Google

the good not only ceases to be good, but becomes itself the evil; and that which was once the evil, is now painfully hungered for as the only good.

And is not this the experience of all, whether on the broadest and highest, or on the narrowest and humblest, theatres of action? Verily, this must be admitted, we think, without much question. So, therefore, there is some truth in the saying — Much of our happiness lies in contrast, or in the alternation of what is called, distinctively, good and evil. And, as said, it is not quite clear that, under the circumstances of our present being, it is possible for man to become the recipient of unvarying, uninterrupted good, so termed — it is not quite certain that the good, continued without break or contrast, would not vindicate what seems to be a law of our nature in its present condition, and change places with the evil, and become itself the shade in life's picture; and so give to it finish and harmony by bringing into bolder relief the principal figures of the composition, and developing more clearly the design of the great Artist.

So wonderful are the arrangements of the Infinite One, and with such unmeasurable skill does he devise and perfect his plans, regardless whether we give one name or another to the means he employs. In his own wisdom and love he carries forward his glorious designs to final completion, and leaves us, as they unfold themselves to our vision, to discover the errors of our hasty judgment, and to see alike the folly of many of our wishes and plans, and our false application of the terms "good" and "evil."

And even in this brief life has not this lesson been taught us again and again? How many times have we seen the life of those called fortunate, darkened into deepest gloom by the very event that was proclaimed a blessing, and at the coming of which all men cried, "It is good!" And few are they who, in the passage of the years, have not been called to acknowledge that what was termed evil at its birth, and wept over with wailings and salt tears, was, after all, God's best messenger to the soul, bringing to it his noblest benedictions. Suffering is oftentimes the furnace in which the gold of the spirit is purified, and, prepared anew with the image and superscription of God, made current at the gates of the kingdom of heaven.

Digitized by Google

Yes, verily, we need alike the discipline of adversity and prosperity. We need the teachings of joy and sorrow, of the sunshine and the rain; for they are equally the good and perfect gifts of heaven, though we may desire never so much to accept the one only, and to put away the other. Good and Evil, if they be not the same, are yet twin-sisters; and though the one may have a brighter face and a sweeter smile than the other, they are both daughters of the same Father, and are passing through our world on the same mission of mercy. And, what is of equal moment, neither, as we have seen, could do her work perfectly alone; and though we may fancy the one more lovely than the other, nothing is more certain than that, without the other, she would lose much of her loveliness, and be robbed of her power to please. The day would soon weary us, if it did not give place to the night. And even the rainbow would lose half its exceeding beauty, were it not that it encircles the brow of the storm.

With these thoughts which, we trust, may help to show somewhat of the uses of evil, and to reconcile us to the providence and government of the Father, we dismiss the subject under this head, and proceed to one more illustration, which may be called,

III. The Argument of Dependence. The definition of this will appear as we advance. It is universally admitted, we suppose, that some things are impossible from their very nature. It is impossible, for example, that a part should be equal to the whole; that white should be black; that a thing should be and not be at the same time. So the relation existing between the numbers 2 and 5, it is impossible to change so that 5 shall be less than 2, or 2 greater than 5. The relations which they sustain to each other are in the nature of things, and of necessity, unchangeable, whatever the name we give to them.

So the relation of dependence between certain things is unchangeable; it being impossible, the world and man being as they are, that one should exist without the other. As example, The delight with which friends, long parted, meet again, depends entirely on the fact of previous separation and absence, without which it could not be ex-

Digitized by Google

perienced. The happiness of reconciliation with one from whom we have long been estranged, depends wholly upon the previous disagreement and coldness; and, without this particular evil, the particular joy in question could have no being. These illustrations are sufficient to show that this relation of dependence between certain things is necessary, and lies in the nature of them, so that one cannot exist without the other. With this let us proceed to apply the principle to the question before us.

It will be allowed very readily, that the virtues of charity, forgiveness, generosity, self-sacrifice, faith, fidelity, are of great worth, and give the highest grace and beauty to the human character. All will agree that without these noble virtues it would become tame and spiritless, with scarcely a single trait to waken our admiration, or call forth our reverence and love. The lively and animating picture of the soul's struggles and triumphs would lose its richest coloring and finish; and life itself would be without point, without any useful or elevating aim.

But if there were no evil in the world, how could these virtues have birth or being? If there were nothing to try our patience or our love, how could the worth and truth of them be proved? If none offended against us, how could we forgive? If none did us evil, how could we obey the greatest of the divine requisitions, "Return good for evil?" If there were no want or sorrow, if there were no injustice or wrong, where would be the noble examples of charity and mercy, of generosity and self-forgetfulness, which have adorned the history of the world, and thrilled multitudes of souls with admiring joy, and sent them forth with inspiration for the same blessed work? If there were no sorrow or pain, where had been those heavenly lessons of patient love, of affectionate devotion under sternest trials? where had been that sweet submission to God, that serene peace, that divine strength, which the frailest child of suffering has at times manifested? leaving a witness before which the strongest and most unwilling have bowed; and through the power of which the humblest and weakest have felt themselves lifted up to new courage and faith.

Nothing can be more manifest here, than the shining silver thread of necessity and dependence, which runs

Digitized by Google

through all this string of heavenly pearls. Nothing is more certain than that without the previous evils, there could have been no place in our world for these noble virtues. Their angel forms, radiant with the fresh beauty of heaven, had never gladdened our eyes. And we should never have known, as now, one half the real value of the rich mines of spiritual treasures which lie hidden within us, and into which only evil has the power to sink the shaft, and bring the glittering ore to the surface.

But again: If there were no error or falsehood, no corruption or vice, no oppression or wrong, where would be our Luthers and Washingtons, our Howards and Oberlins? and where that long line of noble martyrs to truth and duty, that golden chain extending through all time, and binding into one the humanity of all ages, of all climes and opinions; and, through Jesus, linking man to God, and earth to heaven? Is it answered, "There would be no need of them?" I reply, Then there can be no need that some of the highest and divinest principles of human nature should be brought into action, or even have an existence. There can be no need that the world should know, and rejoice in, the gigantic strength, and the heavenly sweetness and gentleness, which the soul gathers up within itself when obedient to the voice of God and duty.

If, then, these virtues are of any worth; if charity, forgiveness, resignation, faith, self-sacrifice, have any value in themselves, or as examples to the world; if they adorn the human character, and are necessary to the perfect development of the human heart, then here again is a reason for the existence of evil. And who, we ask, would, for the sake of avoiding whatever of physical or mental pain he may endure — who, for the sake of escaping the evil, would forego the good, and surrender all the glory and blessedness of these virtues, of this high spiritual discipline?

Would Columbus, with all his discouragements and difficulties, his long waiting, his hopes deferred, his heart-sickness — O when, on that ever memorable morning, the first cry of "Land!" rang through his ship; and the mingled emotions of gratitude and exultation and triumph; his long-cherished dreams fulfilled; an astonished world,

Digitized by Google

an immortal fame; the past and present and future all crowding into one wild delirium, as it went rushing and leaping, blinding, bewildering, through his whole being, thrilling every nerve to its extremest fibre with unutterable joy; — O would he have given that one moment for a whole life of ease and comfort? Did he not feel that it was worth all it had cost? And would Washington have sold the calm joy and honor of the patriot, for the sake of escaping the toils and sufferings to which he was subjected? Would Paul, amid all his perils and woes — would Paul, in the darkest hour of his life, have gone back, and sat again at the feet of Gamaliel? And would the weakest sufferer that ever struggled with disease and pain, exchange the communion with God, the calm faith, the serene peace, that have come through the trial, for the physical ease, and worldly indifference and quiet which were in the place of these, before the great sorrow came?

Ah, no; all these would witness that there is a higher blessedness than mere freedom from evil and suffering. They would, if they could come and speak to us, show us that the true glory of life, lies not so much in the amount of tame happiness and indolent comfort, but in the amount of virtue, in the degree of spiritual advancement. They would show us that the end of our being is best fulfilled, not so much by the success with which we escape trial and suffering, as the success by which we triumph over the passions and prejudices and frailties of our earthly nature, and rise up into the likeness of God.

To this extent our argument proceeds; and here it ends. But before we leave the subject, it seems just and necessary that we should make some reply to an objection which has probably presented itself to the mind of the reader in the course of our investigation. "If your arguments are well founded; if it is impossible for man to receive good uninterruptedly, and have it still retain the elements of good, and the power of producing happiness; if evil is necessary to the perfect development of the spiritual nature of man, and necessary to his positive virtue and highest blessedness — if your arguments are good to prove this, do they not also prove the endless continuance of evil for the same purposes? If it is necessary in this world, why not in the next? why not always?"

Digitized by Google

In reply, we have first to say, that we have argued only for the present. We have proceeded entirely upon the ground of man's present constitution of mind and body, of his relations in this life to God, to his fellows, and to the outward physical universe. We have been careful, throughout the argument, to make this point prominent; for the reason that we know nothing of the condition of man in these respects, in the next world. In the resurrection, or in the future life, he may, and doubtless will, be brought into connection with an entirely new and different set of circumstances and laws; or at least with laws acting on him in new relations, and under new combinations and developments.

When, therefore, this takes place; when man is freed from the earthly body, and, as a spiritual being under spiritual laws, is brought into new and higher relations to the physical universe; and is brought also nearer to, and into more direct communion with God, the arguments we have presented for the existence and uses of evil fail of application. On this ground, therefore, the objection falls; and all the facts and strength of the argument remain untouched.

But let us look at this objection from another point of view. It asks, "If evil is necessary now, in this world, why not in the next world, and always?"

This is surely based on a very narrow view of things. Does it follow, invariably, that whatever is necessary at any given time, must always be necessary after that time? Does it justly and logically follow that every thing which exists in this world, must exist in the next? Most assuredly not; otherwise we must be there in all respects what we are here, and so all progress be forever at an end. What may be necessary at one time and under one set of circumstances, may be entirely unnecessary at another time, and under another set of circumstances.

It would be absurd to contend that, because I use a telescope to see distinctly an object five *miles* distant, I must use the same telescope when the object is only five *feet* distant. The use of the telescope is an evil or inconvenience, to which I am subjected by my distance from the object; but when I come near to it, my relations to it are changed, and I can see without the assistance of the

Digitized by Google

instrument. So in the future; our relations to objects, to the universe, to God, will be so changed, that the discipline of evil may no longer be needed. Then our nearness to God and truth will be such that we may lay aside the telescope, and behold the object of desire with the naked eye of the spirit. In the appropriate words of Paul, "Now we see through a glass darkly, but then we shall see face to face, and know even as we are known."

So it would be very strange if, because the child is taught to say A, B, C, in the primary school, one should contend that when he goes to the academy, and to the college, he should still be taught A, B, C, and nothing else; and that, therefore, the mistress should follow him to the academy, and through his whole collegiate course — nay, through his whole life, repeating continually the A, B, C. Who would not say that this was false reasoning? that the A, B, C, once learned, there was no need for its after repetition; that, having outgrown the primary school, and having learned all that his mistress could teach him, the scholar had no longer any occasion for their services, and, leaving them behind, should go onward in the way of knowledge.

So when we have learned all the lessons that evil can teach us in this world, which is but the primary school of our existence; when we have passed through its painful, but needed discipline — then, leaving the teacher and the school behind us, we rise upward on the wings of the spirit, and take our place in the university of heaven! And there, delivered from the power of evil and the earthly nature, we shall be left free to range the boundless fields of knowledge, and to rise higher and higher toward the infinitely beautiful and perfect.

These examples might be multiplied indefinitely, but sufficient has been offered, it is presumed, to show that the objection which argues that, if evil is necessary in this world, it must be necessary in the next, is based upon a false principle, and derives its seeming force from our ignorance, rather than our knowledge. Though reasoning from analogy may be very well, when confined within proper limits, and may help us forward somewhat in the path of inquiry; yet with a loose rein, and careless of logic, nothing will lead to results more absurd and self-contradictory.

Digitized by Google

And now in closing, let us briefly note our progress. In showing the uses of evil, we employed, *First.*—The argument of activity; which set forth the fact that a large measure of our happiness, and that of the highest order, is found in the full and perfect development of the whole man, of all our physical, mental, and moral powers — and that this, in the present life, is manifestly impossible without the existence of evil; in the overcoming of which alone all our faculties are brought out, and put to their appropriate work. *Second.*—The argument of contrast; which illustrated the point that much of our happiness lies also in the alternations of good and evil, so called; that, therefore, constituted as we are at present, good continued without interruption, would, probably, lose the power to impart happiness, and become itself the evil. *Third.*—The argument of dependence; which showed that many of the positive social virtues depend wholly on the existence of evil for their own existence; and that in these virtues is found the truest happiness, the highest life of the soul.

Such, then, is the process, and such the results, of our inquiry. And assuredly, though but little may have been accomplished, that little will serve to show us with what reverent caution we should sit in judgment on the government and providence of God. The subject, imperfectly as it has been developed, commends itself, nevertheless, to all who ask the momentous question, "Why has God permitted evil to exist?" He who asks it with a rude desire to arraign the divine wisdom and goodness, may find sufficient to humble his pride, and show him his own littleness and ignorance, when compared with Him who knoweth the end from the beginning, and in whom there is no darkness at all. He who asks it with a troubled, but sincere heart, will find enough to encourage and strengthen him. He will not have every difficulty removed, nor an answer to every question he may ask; but there will be light enough to show him that the way is not always dark, nor always rough. Having seen the intimate connection between good and evil in some instances, he will be led to believe it may equally exist in others, though he may not be able to see it. Having sometimes seen how God turns

Digitized by Google

evil to the accomplishment of some of the noblest purposes of his government, he will be ready to trust in him, when he cannot discern such a result, nor even the elements of it.

And this, as said at the outset, is the object of our writing—to gather what light we can on this intricate question, that we may be the better able to wait patiently in regard to those difficulties which, as yet, we have no power to put away. The question of evil has pressed upon all minds with a weight which they would gladly throw off; and many loving and devout hearts have been nigh to falling beneath the burden of it. It is confessed that there are bearings to the question which the human mind does not, at present, seem capable of grasping, some dark problems which it has not power to solve. But while this is readily admitted, we need not sit down in despair; we need not refuse to avail ourselves of what we can have, because we cannot have all. God has not left us wholly in the dark. He has opened the way to *some* knowledge, while, at the same time, he has not left faith without its appropriate work.

Let us, then, gratefully accept whatever measure of light and knowledge He has granted to our anxious inquiries; and, reconciled to his dealings, whether called by us good or evil, let us go forward in the darkest time, amid the profoundest mysteries, with a good courage, and a serene spirit, confident that all will issue well. Let us go forward, remembering always that this world is but a single step in our progress, this life one round only in the shining ladder of our being, which reaches upward and upward, till its top is lost in eternity! Beyond this there are other and higher worlds. All around us lie the fields of unmeasurable space. All above us, and below us, they stretch into the infinite and unknown. And if, while walking here in the dim starlight, with the veil upon us, we can see so much — O how glorious will it be when the veil has dropped from the spiritual vision, when the last earthly shadow has passed from before it, and the full beauty and harmony and magnificence of God's universe burst upon the soul!

T. B. T.

Digitized by Google

Art. XI.

The Christ of the Gospels necessary to explain the Phenomena of Christianity.

Voices of the Church in Reply to Strauss, comprising Essays in Defence of Christianity, by Divines of various Communions. Collected and Compiled by Rev. J. R. Beard, D. D. London: Simpkin & Marshall. 1845.

It has been well said, that men in past ages lived in Christianity; but we, in this age, study it. This is the peculiarity of our time. It is, essentially, a *critical* age; when, not satisfied with the faith of the moral sentiments, the confidence of the heart, men demand a philosophical conviction, and apply to works of the ancient time the test of profound learning, and the rigid formulas of the highest art. The fabrics of dearest and holiest faith, are taken down, and taken in pieces, limb by limb, and joint by joint. Convictions that have lain, unquestioned, at the foundation of all spiritual life, are loosened, and examined in the dry light of reason. The intuitive and the spontaneous, that warm religious life, the effectual working of which supplies every part and member, must pass the test of metaphysical galvanism, and come out a clear, gelid, intellectual verity. Science, that seeks the nether springs of nature, and would rend the veil of mystery from her awful face, resolves all miracle into the electric force, the magnetic current, the nervous and potent will. History, while it wrests from poets their laurels, and from supposed kings their name and very existence, breaking ancient Greece into legends, and dismissing the early pomp of Rome as royal shadows; also abolishes the peculiarity of Jesus, makes his personality a hazy nucleus, the resurrection a story, the gospel a mythology. And philosophy, striving with the soul of man, and the life of the universe, makes of the awful God a logical abstraction, converts the eternal Spirit into an unintelligent force, whose action is only in the material, whose consciousness is only in the human. The *apparent* peculiarity of this age, then, is not absorbing, inter-penetrating faith, but objective vision; intellect

Digitized by Google

throned above sentiment; criticism upon, rather than life in Christianity. It is the age, not of symbols and imagery and concrete expression; but of logical formulas, philosophical statement, and metaphysical abstraction. Not the gospel according to St. Bernard, or Calvin, or Michael Angelo; but according to Kant, and Hegel, and Strauss, and Bruno Bauer.

We are not one of the alarmists. We admit the boldness and ultraism of speculation in the present age. It is, as we have just said, too extremely philosophical, too abstract in its theories; it is lacking in a reverent and considerate spirit; and unduly strains and exalts the intellect. But we cannot join in an unqualified ascription of skepticism and irreligion to the present age. We are inclined, rather, to say that in no age since the earliest epoch of Christianity, have there been in the world more religious life and more genuine faith. The bold errors of the time are the result of earnestness and seeking. The deism, the infidelity of our age, is not as the deism, the infidelity of the last century. However misguided and extravagant, it has a spiritual and a religious life in it. But we believe that the terms irreligious and infidel are applied to many who, least of all, deserve it; whose souls are full of devoutest aspiration; who, in simplifying their views of religion and the religious life, have removed what they believe to be incumbrances to their free and hearty worship, have endeavored to adjust themselves more exactly to their ideas of duty, and have desired to come, and have come, nearer to God. And this free speculation, this scrutiny at the very roots of theological and Christian conviction, though it may have changed terms and modes of statement, has deepened, confirmed, settled, the faith of some of the best and loftiest minds. While we detect much rash speculation, then, much irreverent handling of sacred things, we do not see that wide-spread *skepticism*, that bald *irreligion* which some discover, or apprehend, in the intellectual movements of the present age. We see ultraism, having no root, and destined to wither away, but it is the overgrowth of luxuriant thought. This activity and fermentation is not a sign of death, but of life. It indicates that, at the bottom, there are sincerity and earnestness concerning religious things. It is true, there *is* skepticism, there *is*

Digitized by Google

irreligion in the present age. But much of these lodges in a quarter opposite to that which is generally suspected. They are manifested in that intellectual fear, and that despair of truth, which a recent writer has charged upon our times. We hardly need say that a distrust of the *true*, not of the merely old and accredited, is essentially skepticism. And a lack of confidence in God and in eternal verities, is, we fear, displayed by too many of those who, in our day, hastily quit the open field of free inquiry, and retreat into the venerable sanctuaries of ritual and tradition. We hardly need say, either, that sincere desire after God, and actual communion with him, constitute the real life of religion. There is faith, there is religion in the fanatic, whose soul is roused from its foundations by conceptions of a wrathful and awful Omnipotence, whose life is curtained with clouds and lightnings, and who wrestles in constant agony with his God. And if there be not faith, there is hope, there is life, there is religion, in that heart that seeks after God, if happily it may find him, that is in earnest as if it believed in something earnest and real in existence, and which, though it goes forth alone to explore and to know, cut off from the sympathy and the trust of men, "sorrowing before the mystery of the universe, and scarred in the conflict with doubt," inquires, with anxiety and with prayer, of the Deity, and the world, the Bible, and the soul. But there is no faith or religion in an apathetic worldliness, an unspiritual and frivolous living. Neither is there faith or religion, in a "respectable" and timid conservatism, that never thinks and feels. We prefer sincerity, earnestness, spirituality, under any phase of religious action, to apathy, or formalism. We believe that this earnestness, sincerity, and spirituality, underlies and animates the bold intellectual movement of the present age. For this reason we see not so extensive darkness and infidelity as many may discern. When truth and righteousness are sought after with all the heart, however erroneous the conception and the result, we are not fearful of skepticism, or irreligion. We do not doubt the existence of God, or the permanence and triumph of the truth.

But it is not our chief purpose, in this article, to vindicate the age from the charge of skepticism and irreligion; but to offer a few remarks in reply to one of those errors which

Digitized by Google

have furnished occasion for this charge. This error, as we deem it, consists in ascribing too much to the *abstract* and the *absolute*, and in under-estimating the *concrete* and the *historical*. There is an attempt to select and separate eternal verities from the form in which they are conveyed to us — while the essential importance of the form itself, is overlooked. In one word, there is an attempt to separate the absolute in Christianity, from the documentary and the personal — from Christ and the gospel.

The theory of Dr. Strauss, "the *mythical* theory," involves this error; and it is for this reason that we have placed at the head of this article, the title of a work which, under the name, "Voices of the Church," contains replies to that theory by scholars of different communions. It is not our intention to examine the position of Dr. Strauss, which if able to do, we could not do justly, as we know nothing of it, save by the representation of others. But the remarks we shall make, in this article, are based upon the following statement of the mythical doctrine, as exhibited by Dr. Beard.

"The church made its Founder, not consciously, nor with any evil design, but naturally in the progress of events, and out of elements which history, fact, and opinion, had put into the minds of its members. Jesus was born, lived, and died, in the land of Judea, about the usually alleged era. He believed himself to be the Messiah, expected by the Jews. This belief gained converts in process of time. The first believers recognized Jesus as the Jewish Messiah. But if he was really the Messiah, then he must have had all those qualities which characterized the Messiah. Accordingly, whatever element entered as a component part into the current idea of the Messiah, was found in or ascribed to Jesus. Hence the bulk of the so-termed facts of the gospels; hence all the miracles. The few scanty facts of the actual life of Jesus grew into an ample, complex, diversified, inharmonious mythology. In all this there was no deception, except self-deception, certainly no intention to palm off on the world a historical falsehood. The process was slow, gradual, unobserved. By degrees all the bright lights which the Jews saw or fancied in their expected Messiah, were thrown around the head of Jesus, forming a halo — a sacred nimbus, which still more and

Digitized by Google

more delighting its own parent, the human mind, was perpetually supplied with fresh poetic materials, taken originally from the Old Testament scriptures, or the abundant sources afforded by tradition. Hence Jesus became the focus where all the rays met which Judaism and Christianity united to furnish. Christ was compounded out of Old Testament history, rabbinical tradition, popular desires and mistakes, and *the small element which his personal influence contributed.* The *idea* represented by the *name* Jesus Christ was an aggregation of such materials as the spirit of past ages combined with the spirit of the primitive Christian age to make active in the human mind."

If this is a correct statement of the mythical theory, then, according to Strauss, Christ did not develop Christianity, but Christianity developed Christ. Jesus did not make his biographers, but his biographers made Jesus. The documentary and the historical are frittered away; ideas and abstractions are substituted in their place. The personal history of Jesus is made a little thing, a mere thread; the bulk of his life is attributive, a mere mythology. In opposition to this and kindred theories, we maintain that Jesus was a cause and not an effect; in short, we lay down the proposition that the Christ of the gospel is necessary to explain the phenomena of Christianity.

To prove this proposition, we remark, that *Christ is himself Christianity.* His life, his deeds, manifest its spirit, and constitute its very identity. No doubt the precepts of Christianity are eternal moralities. Its doctrines are the highest and holiest truth. But it needs the personality of Christ to bind these precepts into a harmonious whole, and to give to these doctrines prevalence and efficacy. It is not as though we found them in the scriptures of some Persian or Indian sage; in the sublime speculations of some philosopher, strewn along in aphorisms, or abrupt, logical propositions. We have to account for their embodiment in a system; for their influence upon so many minds and hearts. The solution of this is the life of Christ. These precepts and doctrines have become flesh and blood for us. In the gospels, they stand as living realities. And this because they are fragments of the life of Christ. His moral lineaments run all through them.

Digitized by Google

His spirit, his personal manner, penetrates and informs them. They are built up and assimilated in the divine structure of his character. Take away the Personal Christ from the gospels, leaving the same precepts and doctrines, and the whole aspect of Christianity would change, as the aspect of the earth changes when the sun goes down. The same eternal mountains lift their heads to heaven; the same rivers flow onward. But their animation is gone. They are cold and gray and dark. Thus would Christianity be without that central Personage, around which all its glories cluster,—from which they stream. Christianity is revealed to us in the Form that walked the streets of Jerusalem and the shores of the Galilean lake; that bent over the sick-couch and the bier; mingled in the festival of Cana, and reclined at the Last Supper; stood in serene dignity before the judgment-seat of Pilate, and bore a cross up the way of sorrow; and hung and prayed upon that accursed wood, and came forth, radiant, from the sleep of death, and the broken chambers of the sepulchre. Christianity is illustrated for us through the life of Christ. We first receive it through the circumstances of his personal history. We cannot separate its truths from *him;* or, if we do, and reduce them to abstract propositions, it is difficult to account for the peculiar and religious hold they have upon us, such as the mere maxims of the wisest and the best never had, and never can have. Those precepts thrill us with a holy power, because they drop from living lips of purity. Those doctrines overawe and convince us with their immense and lofty truth, because One speaks them having the authority of a holy mien, a divine presence. Whatever we may say, then, about the essential truth of Christianity; about its permanent and abstract morality, its absolute religion—its unction and its power depend upon its historical phasis, upon the personal Christ as delineated in its documents. The brightness of his shadow falls all over these truths. We feel his presence where we see him not; as, looking into that part of a lake where no shadow lies, in its solemn depths and stillness we feel the proximity, the brooding presence of the majestic mountain. When men re-claim the precepts of Jesus, and say, "This belongs to Confucius, and this to Zoroaster, and this to Socrates;" we reply, If it be so, it is little

Digitized by Google

matter. Christ gave these precepts a vital element. The truths of those old sages lay, like dry bones, all along the valley of our vision. The Son of man breathed on them, and they became erect and alive. Christ penetrated these moralities with his own spirit. He gathered them up, and re-presented them in his own personality. His life is their element. Their lineaments are the lineaments of his own character. To those, then, who say that the personal Christ is, comparatively, of little importance; that his truth, the moral element in his system, constitute Christianity,—we reply that, abstractly, they do constitute Christianity. But we contend that their effect upon us is because of the form in which they have appeared to us—the life and character, the personal history of Jesus.

But, again; not only does Christ give to Christianity its living efficacy, by imparting unity and personality to its precepts and its doctrines; but, without his history as presented in the gospels, we cannot account for the effect which Christianity has had upon his cotemporaries and upon the world. Take these four gospels. Here is an account of one Jesus. The picture is there—ascribe it to what, or to whom we will. It is there with all its moral beauty. And what a picture! Who is the historian that has drawn one like it? What so answers to our highest ideal? Where such a representation of the best estate of humanity? Where such an embodiment of our best conception of God? How harmoniously do the best products of all nations blend in him? There is a philosophy surely as grand as Plato's; a dignity calm and great as that of Socrates. And yet, there are a child-like innocence, a profound piety, and a flow of moral sentiment, so deep and pure, that they shame the scoffer, and touch the very atheist's heart. There is an evidence of communion with God,—of nearness to the Eternal—that surrounds him with a divine halo, makes his face to shine with holiness, and descends in consecration to the very skirts of his garments—proclaiming him the very Christ. And yet there is a broad and genial philanthropy, like that of no other teacher.

The common people hear him gladly. Poor, sick, weary humanity clings to him as to a brother. The diseased turn upon him their wistful eyes; the leper crouches at his feet; the sorrowful tell him their griefs; the guilty go out

Digitized by Google

from his holy rebuke, healed and penitent; his disciples lean upon his bosom, and catch his last look from the cross. And with all this pure and kindly life blends a sacred endurance, a majesty of sorrow, that has made sorrow to be, henceforward, something great and divine. The best and broadest moral precepts that the world has ever known, are illustrated in his life as they cannot be defined in words. Doctrines that lay hold of the most vital realities, are announced by him — are in him. That "Father, forgive them; they know not what they do!" rising from the agony of the cross, outdoes the sublimity of the mere precept. "Love your enemies;" and "I am the resurrection and the life!" thrills us more even than the opening of his sepulchre. Here, then, we say, is delineated a life which all may study, but which no one can adequately describe; surrounded by precepts and doctrines of the holiest sentiment and most kindling power; important as our spiritual nature; great as the Fatherhood of God, and broad as human fraternity. And how are we to account for it? If the biographers invented Jesus, who were those biographers? Jews? Is Christ a Jewish Messiah? How, then, do we account for his death — and such a death? Are those thorns and that cross the diadem and principality of David? Or, if this is a Jewish conception spiritualized, how account for that refinement from all gross and material ideas of power and empire? Nor can it well be the after-work of disappointed hope and ambition — the invention of an ingenious apologist. There is nothing Jewish in those universal ideas; in that toleration for the Samaritan; in that rebuke of Pharisaic formality and tradition. But, is this the delineation of some polished Gentile pen? Whence, then, the rudeness and simplicity of the style; the intimate acquaintance with the Jewish life and prejudices?

And if this hypothesis of a Christ invented, as a whole, is thus perplexed and difficult, the proposition of a gradual formation is absolutely incredible. The congruity, the fitness, the moral unity of the whole character, its identity all through the gospels, refute this notion. What kind of a life was that, to which all, with one consent, began to make ascription? Which was made to realize the most venerable traditions, and to fulfil the best prophecies; to which the human intellect transferred its highest ideal, and

Digitized by Google

the human heart its holiest sentiment? Which was arrayed with all the splendor of Jewish hope. To which Gentile philosophy attributed the utterance of its divinest truths. What was this filament of a sacred personality — this nucleus of a Christ, to which these gifts were all so readily ascribed; in whom they first came together, and found their mutual relation; with whom they became identified — until the individual whom they made stood up before the ages, and all hearts felt, and all lips cried, "Lo! very God, and perfect man!"

Now, however ingenious and plausible these theories may be, they all labor more than the simple proposition that Christ made his biographers — that we have the record of a veritable life — and that in the overshadowing presence of that life this record was written. It is evidently in the style of artless, unlearned men, impressed to overflow with the greatness of the character they transcribed, relating in simple yet graphic sketches the thing that transpired before their eyes, the words that fell upon their ears.[1]

Towards the close of the second century, we find these four gospels, containing this same divine portrait, spread abroad in at least sixty thousand manuscript copies,[2] in the hands of at least three millions of Christians, ready to live and to die for their faith in its correctness. These sixty thousand copies, scattered here and there throughout the Roman world, must have had a common source, for they bear the same stamp. But if so, then, at the time when they emanated from that original, they must have contained this invented Christ, the product of myths and legends constructed into a harmonious whole; and it required some time to effect this process. The hypothesis we are now considering, it must be remembered, fixes the advent of this germinal Christ, the groundwork of this mythology, at about the common date. So, we have not only to account for the reception of these myths, in the first place, but to find time for their assimilation into the Christ of the gospels, and also time for their transfer into sixty thousand manuscript copies, so accurately, with the addi-

[1] Mr. Furness has, we think, nearly demonstrated the historical truth of the gospels from this point of view. See his "Jesus and his Biographers."

[2] Vide Norton's Genuineness of the Gospels, vol. i.

Digitized by Google

tion of no more myths, each a transcript of the other, scattered throughout the Roman empire, in the hands of three millions of Christians, and all before the close of the second century.

But another fact comes in here — the often-quoted historical fact, that long before this last quarter of the second century, there were men scattered abroad calling themselves Christians — and often martyrs for their faith in Christ. More than this; they were ready to die for their testimony that they had *seen* and *heard* what is recorded in our gospels. In the city of Jerusalem, in the presence of those who had counselled the death of Jesus, stood two apostles, Peter and John, preaching that Jesus, and his resurrection from the dead. Ignorant and simple men, persecuted and imprisoned, they astonished their judges. And well they might. Galilean peasants, hurling such strong rebuke against the proud Sanhedrim of Jerusalem! Telling it that this Jesus, whom it had crucified, was the head of the corner, that there is salvation in no other name under heaven; and convincing the hearts of thousands! It was nothing like insanity; it was their boldness that astonished the Jews. There was but one way to account for this. "They took knowledge of them, that they had been with Jesus." This Jesus to them, then, was no common claimant to the Messiahship, no mere shred of a teacher; but one whose spirit, whose works, whose moral power, were such as to infuse this boldness into his disciples. Personal contact with Jesus alone accounts for this great and courageous movement. And he who could make men so brave and strong must have been a personage of no common power — must have been one like him who is delineated in the gospels. In his own divine life is the well-spring of all after-action. Not only these two apostles, but the whole Roman world is moved by him. Men labor, and wander, and suffer, and die for him. They brave extremest peril, they endure scourging, stoning, shipwreck, imprisonment. They dare the learning of Athens, the pride of Rome, the luxurious pomp of Corinth, the mobs of Thessalonica and Ephesus, the searching scrutiny of Berea, the rude paganism of Lystra and Melita. Their midnight psalms peal out from gloomy dungeons. Their sublime truths grow more eloquent among the mar-

Digitized by Google

bles of the Acropolis. Their deep, calm reasoning shakes rulers on their thrones. Their object is the conquest of the world! And to that end they go forth with the simple zeal of conviction, the utterance of truth, and the manifestation of divine assistance. Bond and free, rich and poor, men of all nations and opinions, hear them, believe them, acknowledge the Christ whom they preach as the Saviour and Great Teacher, and melt into a common brotherhood. And is all this strong evidence of the book of Acts, fabulous also? We must beware how we say this. We are descending now into the dawn of modern history. Light breaks upon us from disinterested sources. Tacitus gives evidence that the scholar will hardly dispute, and burning testimony flashes upon us from those human torches with which Nero illuminates the imperial city.

There were Christians, then, scattered in the four quarters of the Roman world, believing that Christ lived, and died, and rose again. It is now only about thirty years from his alleged death, and here are men suffering martyrdom for their cause — dying for their faith in fables accumulated in this brief time! How do we account for the existence of these Christians? They must have diverged from some common centre. Their faith and their action must have had an origin! Was that origin an ideal personage, one around whose slender identity had grown a husk of mythology? No; the mass of these believers, at least, must have received the Christ of the gospels, must have received him as a historical and personal verity, from the lips of original apostles and their associates. We come, then, again to the inquiry, Who excited these apostles to action? What gave them their boldness? The best we can do, as it appears to us, is to acknowledge that they had been with Jesus, the Jesus of the New Testament. Evidently, a life of divinest spirituality, of wondrous works, of the highest moral purity, had burned this depth of zeal into their hearts, had animated them with this irresistible conviction, had armed them with this invincible courage.

But we have to account, also, for the effect which Christianity has produced upon succeeding ages. Into the world there has been poured a stream of new life, of new ideas; a stream which we can clearly trace. From the boundary-line between ancient and modern civilization it

Digitized by Google

comes sweeping on, giving to the latter its essential peculiarity. While Greece is growing dim, and Rome is crumbling away, there appears a new power, fresh and vigorous with young life. It starts up in no isolated colony, founded upon some strange shore. Its strength is not in wealth, or literature. It marches not with sword and banner. But scattered here and there in individual bosoms, in the hearts of humble men, lurking in catacombs and upper chambers, ridiculed by the genius, despised by the learning of the time; denounced by priests, and persecuted by kings; somehow, with a strange power it gains the ears and souls of thousands, and works the mightiest moral revolution the world has ever experienced. The fire grows pale on Grecian altars. Rome falls. The night of barbarism descends — a night of storm and flood that oversweep the bulwarks of the ancient civilization. But on the tossing billows of that deluge rides the new power, like an ark, spanned by the bow of promise, and bearing the hopes and the destinies of the race within its sheltering bosom. And an influence has gone out from it, which has changed, and shall yet far more gloriously change, the face of the civilized world.

Now, we have a right to ask whence came this new life, suddenly, bounding like the fresh blood through a main artery, renovating the world's weary heart? Whence came this regenerating element? Is it the result of myths and fables — the work of a Jewish enthusiast, who fancied himself the Christ, but whose obscure life was only a vital fibre to which legends assimilated themselves, and to which strange virtue was gradually ascribed? But we cannot so forcibly present this argument as in the words of Quinet, found in Mr. Beard's volume, and which has suggested to us the present train of discussion. "Who sees not," says he, speaking of Christ's first meeting with his disciples, "on one hand the authority of Jesus — the power attached to his features, his voice, his gesture, his mysterious word — and, on the other, the fishermen attracted by that word, carried away, overcome, fascinated by the grandeur which appeared in the midst of them? For myself, I cannot, I confess, yet read this opening of the gospel without hearing the echo of that very voice which said to the fishermen of Galilee, 'Rise, and walk,

Digitized by Google

and go to the end of the world;' so much is there in it of an enthusiasm which is felt and regarded. That is the *Fiat Lux* in the gospel-creation; it is the movement which itself produces all others. At this command, you hear the disciples rise and thrust before them the ancient civilization." "How could this despoiled Christ," says he, "this shade of which no appreciable vestige remains, this wandering ghost in tradition, have influenced all the time which has elapsed since? I see the moral universe shaken, but the *primum mobile* escapes me. If, in the New Testament there be no spontaneity, whence did life come? Could a new form of society be the result of a plagiarism? If the new law be nothing but the re-production of the old; if the creative spirit have nowhere manifested itself; if the miracle of the renewing of the world were never accomplished, what do we here, and why are we not in the walls of the ancient city? *That which in fact evinces the personal grandeur of Christ is not so much the gospel he gave, as the spirit of the times which have succeeded him!* Did I know nothing of the Scriptures, and were the name of Jesus effaced from the earth, I should still suppose that there had been, somewhere, an omnipotent impulse about the time of the Roman emperors." In reply to a remark of Strauss concerning the case of a few sick Galileans compared with the wonders of modern invention, Quinet adds: "He [Strauss] knows well that the miracle of Christianity is not this cure, but rather the prodigy of humanity extended on its sick couch, there cured of the leprosy of castes, of the blindness of Pagan sensuality, and which, suddenly rising, walks far from the threshold of the old world." As we can only account for the centrifugal force of our planet, by referring it to a primitive impulse imparted direct from the hand of God, so can we account for the phenomena of Christian civilization, and Christian influence in the world, only by attributing the first movement to the personal action of Jesus Christ.

There was a point to which we intended to refer; an argument resting upon spiritual and experimental grounds. An argument based upon the fact that salvation must come to us from without and from above; and that Christ, in his own personality, furnishes us with that manifestation of the divine character and of perfected humanity, which

Digitized by Google

presents to us the motives and means of salvation. We can hardly be saved by abstractions, but by a personal and divine agency. We leave this point, however, for the present; and here rest our argument in proof of the proposition that the Christ of the gospels is necessary to explain the phenomena of Christianity; and, therefore, any theory which overlooks or underrates the importance of the historical and personal features of the gospels, must be fallacious. What we can do, now that Christianity has been illustrated for us, is not to be confounded with what we might have done, had we never received that illustration. The criticism of our day performs but a sorry task, when it overlooks the importance of Christ's agency, and speculates upon the capacity of other light than his. It works in an ungenerous, as well as an ungrateful spirit. It sees by the instruments which he furnished, and then boasts its own powers of vision. The great doctrines which Jesus exhibited — those embodied orbs of truth and love and holiness — the philosophic critic reduces to their primal elements, and then boasts how he, too, could discover and construct. As well say that, in that nebulous womb of matter, you can find every bone and artery of a planet, and draw hence the structure of a harmonious and perfect world! The influence which Christ and Christianity have had upon the world, we leave to be told by the difference between ancient and modern history; between the ages that gather around the thunder-throned Jupiter, and the ages that venerate the crucified Christ; between the inefficiency of lawgivers and sages, and the world-wide expansiveness of Paul and Howard; between the grand speculations of Plato and Socrates, and the confirmed, triumphant faith of the meanest Christian. For this difference, and for these latter results, we can best account by referring to the personal influence of that Christ who is delineated in the New Testament. We close in the words of another: "All great religions have been historical; the thorough interweaving of all the roots of Christianity with the history of the world on which it has sprung, is at once a source of its power, and an assurance of its divineness; and the attempt to give it an abstract character, to loosen its connection with the individuality of Christ, and disengage from

Digitized by Google

it a metaphysical indestructibility, called 'Absolute Religion,' is a mistake, in our opinion, not only of its particular genius, but of the universal springs of human faith."[4]

E. H. C.

Art. XII.

Religion and the Fine Arts.

In a former article on religion and the fine arts, we endeavored to exhibit the philosophical and historical connection that subsists between religion and art, and to point out also, in particular, the strong impression which Christianity has left on all the grand productions of artistic genius in modern times. In the few additional pages that we mean to occupy here, we wish to show, still further, that not only are religion and art thus necessarily and intimately connected, but also that this connection and the reciprocal influence of the two, which results from it, are entirely legitimate; that the love of the beautiful and the cultivation of art are a duty, and that the employment of the fine arts in connection with the institutions and services of religion, is at once proper and productive of good. And we mean, also, to present, in the course of our article, some practical suggestions on the way and form and degree, in which we think a further use of the arts may be made with no small advantage in our religious exercises and rites.

The basis of religion, as we have stated in our previous article, is the idea of the good; the basis of science is the idea of the true, and the basis of art the idea of the beautiful. The two essential elements, again, of the æsthetic principle, or principle of beauty, as we have presented them in the analysis heretofore given, are unity and variety in their several forms of combination. Wherever variety appears pervaded and determined throughout by a perfect unity, with the variety and unity equally conspicuous, we recognize what is denominated, in the strictest sense, beauty. If the unity is the more conspicuous of the two, we call it the grand; and if,

[4] Prospective Review, for February, 1846, p. 114.

Digitized by Google

further still, the unity is the only thing noticeable, it brings up the idea of sublimity. On the other hand, where variety predominates, we find the picturesque; and if variety alone is observed, it is sheer irregularity and confusion. Such, then, are the leading modifications and phases which the æsthetic principle presents to our every-day observation; and to cultivate a love for all the forms and manifestations of beauty that meet us here, whether exhibited in nature or in art, or in human character and life, is, as we think can be shown, the undeniable duty of man.

The primary duty of man, the one grand duty which comprehends all other duties, is *to love God supremely.* But what means it to love God, and what is it we love? In our highest idea of God, he presents himself as the primitive and living unity of the good, the beautiful, and the true, in their absolute essence. God, considered in his intrinsic essence and substantial nature, which is "pure love,"—considered as the source of well-being to all finite existence, and as the ultimate end of every legitimate aspiration and effort, is the absolute good; considered, again, as a *real, existent* being, the grand and original of all other reality, he is the unconditionally *true;* and considered as the Infinite *One*, the One-all and All-one, he is the realized ideal of absolute sublimity, the highest form of the æsthetic principle. In loving God, then, aright, we as really and as fully love the beautiful in its pure and primary essence, as we do the good or the true; and the love of God, therefore, as much involves and authorizes the love of whatever is really beautiful here on earth, as it does the love of all that is true and good; and hence the cultivation of art, which is simply the embodiment of beauty, takes its origin and sanction from the same high source and authority as religion itself; and if, as we endeavored to establish in our former article, religion and art do necessarily reproduce and reinforce each other, then we shall be warranted in the still further conclusion, that the fine arts are susceptible of a religious application, and that they may be employed rightfully and advantageously in promotion of Christian devotion.

A few words of digression must be allowed us, before going farther, in order to correct an erroneous opinion

Digitized by Google

sometimes entertained respecting the proper sphere of the beautiful and sublime. Many seem to be possessed with the notion that beauty must be looked for only in material and visible symbols, and that it is, therefore, confined to outward nature and the strictly æsthetical arts, and can never be found either in the productions of science or the master-works of individual character and life. But if the definition of beauty, which we have given above, — *il piu nell' uno*, as the Italian masters express it — be admitted as correct, nothing can be more erroneous than such an opinion. There is, in truth, as real beauty in the geometrical demonstrations of Pythagoras and Newton, in the Analytical Mechanics of Lagrange, and the metaphysical works of Spinosa and Kant, as in the most admired productions of Phidias or Raphael. The Critique of Pure Reason, dryly metaphysical as it is, and loudly reproached for obscurity and jargon as it has been, does yet, for one species of beauty — the severe beauty, we mean, of comprehensive system and rigorous method and scientific precision — stands without a rival among the productions of human genius. Loftier and nobler still is the divine beauty that irradiates the perfect character. That symmetrical coördination of the various faculties, feelings and sentiments of our nature, and that thorough subordination of them all to one great idea, one grand principle of duty, which distinguished so signally the glorious character of Washington, and still more the godlike character of Jesus, constitute the brightest exemplification of the highest order of beauty that is ever exhibited on the theatre of time. Beauty, then, must not be narrowed down to the measures of sense. There is a beauty of science, and a "beauty of holiness," as well as of figure and of rhythm.

To the *a priori* argument offered above, with the design of legitimating the love of the beautiful and the cultivation of the fine arts, and, by consequence, their employment in connection with religion, may be added also the confirmations afforded by experience and fact. Who, we would ask, has not felt, in the experience of his own heart, the incalculable and invaluable influence of religious symbols? Who has ever stood alone and glanced over the fair face of this lovely earth, or gazed up into the star-spangled azure of heaven, and not felt, the while, that all this profu-

Digitized by Google

sion of magnificence and beauty must be from some greater than human skill, and for some higher than human end? — has not felt there is a God, and that his own duty is, to adore him? This boundless universe of created beings, of worlds and systems of worlds, all radiant throughout with beauty and sublimity, does indeed become to us, if we but heed it, an ever-present and enduring memorial of the one infinite and eternal Creator, and it has been to many souls "none other than the gate of heaven." Nature, viewed aright, is but a symbol of divinity, and sense itself may become a stimulant and "guide to piety."

Inferior, no doubt, but still inestimably great and inspiring, is the influence exerted on the susceptive heart by all the nobler works of human genius. The stranger, who gazes on the grand cathedrals of Strasburg and Friburg, who enters the minster of York, or St. Peter's Church at Rome, though he be a mere trifler and worldling, is seized, we are told, with instinctive reverence and irresistible impulses to devotion. The traveller who passes through the villages of New England, marks everywhere, constantly recurring, among the most prominent and characteristic objects of notice, the hallowed edifices dedicated to Christian worship; and, at their silent suggestion, is led, unawares, and despite of himself, into religious reflections. The national orator, who stands before assembled thousands on our great anniversary occasions, catches sight of the rising towers and lofty spires around him, pointing the finger of faith to heaven, and from his own quickened bosom breathes a new inspiration into the breasts of his unnumbered hearers. And, indeed, every wayfaring man, as he walks his accustomed rounds of business, has, we doubt not, something of pious thought and feeling daily awakened in him by these surrounding monuments of religion. How many hearts, too, have been touched and had their religious sensibilities powerfully moved and invigorated through the evangelical ministrations of the Christian painter? And to how many more has the solemn and impressive voice of the organ, rolling forth its rich volumes of deep-stirring, exulting, holy melody, been as the music of angels to lead the soul upward to heaven, and unite it in the songs and choral symphonies of those who circle the eternal throne rejoicing? But especially

Digitized by Google

where all these are combined, where architecture, painting, music, poetry, all coöperate in the service of devotion, there, certainly, we may look for religious impressions of no ordinary depth and power. Those grand cathedrals of the old world, a dim shadow, in their vastness, of the infinite and eternal; and a type, in their form and details, of the Christian's feelings and faith; so full within of religious mementoes and lofty æsthetical influences; hung all round with golden lamps; adorned all over with pictures and images of inspired apostles and apostolic men, softly lighted with faint and fading gleams of mellow sunlight, that stray in through the checkered glass, amid figures of martyrs and saints, and resounding aloud with holy chant and deep-toned organ — these may have for some minds, it is possible, no religious meaning or power; but to thousands of souls they have been, undeniably, but the outer court to the temple not made with hands. We believe, then, the æsthetic arts have an important part to play in the service of religion; and we would gladly see them appear to a much greater extent among the forms and ministrations of the sanctuary.

A variety of objections will, doubtless, be urged against the practical conclusions, which the foregoing remarks are designed to sustain. It may be said that the proper organs of religion are reason and conscience, and that sense and æsthetic sensibility will serve only to counteract its growth and power in the soul. In reply, we affirm, that this view of the true sphere and means of religion, is one great error that prevails too generally among the Protestant sects of our day. Sense and sensibility are not necessarily opposed to religion, and do not always interfere with its influence. The senses are as susceptible of religious culture and religious use as the passions, the sentiments, or reason itself. Tell us, why is it that men set apart a building especially for the purposes of worship, and sedulously exclude from it the common concerns of business, but that they wish to have, and feel it for their good to have, all the arrangements, appurtenances and associations of their public worship such as will speak to them solely of their spiritual relations, and will keep, the while, from their sight and minds, as much as may be, the corrupting cares of this world? Why is it we celebrate

Digitized by Google

the two sacraments of baptism and the eucharist, but that outward and sensible rites are sometimes the medium of inward and spiritual blessings? And why is it, too, that we seek with eagerness, as we do, the sacred melodies of voice and instrument, if it be true that every exercise of sense be really pregnant with danger to "pure and undefiled religion?" Music, painting, architecture, and every thing that affects us through the senses, may, it is true, have an earth-born spirit and tendency; but they may also draw their inspiration from above. If they speak of holy themes in holy tones, they will not assuredly excite unholy impressions. This Quaker crusading, so common in these times, against every thing formal, æsthetic and sensible in Christian worship, is, in point of truth, a crusade against the auxiliaries and safeguards of religion itself; and the professed Quaker of our day, naturally enough, becomes but too frequently a mere prosy worldling. This moral, rationalistic religion, which forbids all appeals to the senses or sensibilities or sentiments, is, at best, a very cold and barren thing; and the heart can derive from it no warmth nor expansion nor exaltation. Man is not all reason and conscience, nor is he affected through these alone; he has within him a world of pent-up feeling, and he craves something to arouse his sensibilities, something that will stir up emotion and kindle his heart into the glow of spiritual devotion.

It may be objected, again, that this sentimental and æsthetical religion, which seems to be advocated here, is not by any means the religion of the gospel, and does not accord with the genius of Christianity. The kind of religion, we may be told, to which the great Teacher exhorts us, is a religion, not of sentiment nor of fancy, but of conscientious principle and practical goodness. In order to obviate, in a satisfactory manner, whatever force this objection may be supposed to possess, it will be proper to notice, here, what it is that constitutes the grand, central idea of Christianity, and contains the ground of intrinsic distinction between it and the fundamental doctrine and institutes of Moses.

The Hebrew prophet revealed the deity at once, as the eternal *I Am*, the only *living and true God*, and as the *Infinite One*, the *sublimest* object of human conception;

Digitized by Google

but he did not reveal him, with equal distinctness, as the absolute *Good*, the Father of his creatures and the God of love. The practical creed and code, which followed in the train of this primary article of faith, were its appropriate and natural sequence. A pompous and imposing ceremonial, acting on the senses and enkindling the most fiery religious enthusiasm, and a strictness of faith and formal observance almost sectarian, strikingly illustrated the merits and defects of that pioneer-dispensation, which, though of divine origin indeed, was yet not intended nor required to be perfect. These peculiarities, which were allowed in the original system a marked and striking prominence, in order to meet the special wants and circumstances of the people and age for which they were designed, came, with the process of time, to protrude ou in still stronger relief. Not the "most straitest" nor the most valiant knight of the church militant, in our times, is a more strenuous champion for unveering orthodoxy of creed, than was the Jew of our Saviour's day; nor has such exorbitant importance been ever, before or since, ascribed to symbolical forms and ritual observances. The teachings of the great Author of Christianity were given in direct view of the deficiencies, numerous and palpable, that obtained in the elder testament of the law and the prophets; and hence, while he revealed eternal truth as it *is* in its absolute purity and perfection, he still dwelt, at the same time, as was fitting, more particularly on those aspects and elements of the truth, which men had always before overlooked and neglected. Accordingly, with most peculiar emphasis does he continually exhibit the Deity, as the primitive, unlimited *good*, as the universal Father, the living impersonation of pure and perfect love; and he uses this peculiar emphasis, on the one hand, because the good is, in fact, the very essence and substance of the divine nature, the basis alike of beauty and truth, and therefore really in itself superior to them both; and, on the other hand, because anterior to his advent, this particular element of the divine character had been greatly overlooked and disregarded, and called therefore for special illustration and enforcement. But, for all this, he is not any the less earnest in setting forth the Deity at the same time, as being both the Infinite One, the highest ideal of

Digitized by Google

eternal beauty, and also the only *true* God, the ultimate ground of all reality, and the basis, by consequence, of philosophy and science.

So far, then, as our finite reason can see, the prophet of Nazareth has given us the perfect view of the nature of God and the character of true religion, and, if we have interpreted that view aright, it as truly sanctions and sanctifies science and art, as it does the disciplines of morality and virtue. In his general instructions, too, while condemning, as he emphatically did, the undue attention and undue importance, which the Jews of his day gave to the ordinances and ceremonials of the law, he still utters no syllable of censure against their authorized use, and conforms in his own practice to their legitimate requirements. And, what is more, he establishes new rites himself, and leaves us his own example as a testimony to the efficacy and value of outward symbols. If, then, we would cherish and diffuse Christianity in its pristine purity, we must do so from the love, and in the direction, of the beautiful and true, as well as of the good. We must study the Christian religion and the character of its Founder, in each one of their aspects and features. That character should be presented and contemplated in all its divine beauty, all its moral sublimity, as well as in its unapproachable purity and goodness. By confining ourselves entirely to the moral and practical side of religion, we shall lose not a little of genuine Christian experience and life; we shall be wanting not a little in spiritual insight and devotional enthusiasm. A certain degree of theological science is indispensably requisite to guide us in the practice of religion; and a certain use of art, as we have endeavored to show, is of no small service in awakening those sentiments and emotions that are the surest fountains of an elevated and earnest life. Science and art, in short, mount up, at their summits, into religion, and may, therefore, with strictest propriety, be summoned to her aid, and made subservient to her advancement.

It may be objected, yet again, that if we once allow the use of the fine arts and of ceremonies, to any considerable extent, in connection with our worship, the usage will soon degenerate into either pure sentimentality, or barren ritualism, as it has done before in the case of the Catholics and

Digitized by Google

the Jews. Any apprehensions of this kind will appear, however, we are confident, utterly futile to all who are moderately acquainted with the American character. The tendency of the Anglo-Saxon, and especially of the Anglo-American mind is entirely towards the opposite extreme. We are too practical and rationalistic, too utilitarian and calculating, and we particularly need something to waken up pure and profound sentiment, and to quicken the fires of spontaneous devotion. Let not, then, any of American birth take fright at mere phantoms of vapor.

There is one other important consideration which it remains for us to notice and urge in support of the views which are here maintained. The time is coming, when the arts will command extensive attention, and exert a powerful influence in our whole community. Literature and art, as Plato has justly asserted, follow invariably in the train of opulence and refinement. The noble productions of Allston, Powers, Clevenger, Upjohn, Waters, are clear indications, that this country is destined to become, at some future day, a grand gallery of the arts, as well as a citadel of liberty, and a temple, as we trust, of religion and virtue. That the opinion here expressed is not altogether peculiar, may be seen from an article by Greenough, on American Art, in the Democratic Review. If, then, the arts are to grow up and flourish among us, it becomes important to know, or rather to predetermine, what shall be their character and tendency. If their prevailing theme and genius and tone shall be sensual and worldly, they may polish and refine the national character, it is true, but they will not exalt or ennoble it. To exercise a pure and elevating influence, the artist's subject must be borrowed, more or less, from religious experience and history; the spirit of Christianity must be studied, and be transfused, as far as may be, into all the higher creations of fancy. We wish, then, thus to forestall and preoccupy. We would secure, in advance, a religious tone and character to American art. We would connect its grandest efforts with the spiritual relations and interests of man; and, by so doing, on the one hand, preclude aims and tendencies that are unholy, and, on the other, enlist its best services directly in the cause of religion. There are thousands of men in the Christian church, who have genuine

Digitized by Google

taste for art, and who will be sure to give it their patronage, in one form or another; why, then, will they not use their patronage in a religious direction? and why will they not, instead of contributing for fancy pictures to decorate public edifices, or their private dwellings, contribute for a few grand sacred paintings to adorn the walls of their churches, and for a noble Christian architecture to be the shrine and stimulant of their devotions.

There is, also, it must be remembered, a large class of people in every community, who possess keen æsthetic sensibilities and strong tendencies to enthusiasm, and who, if once converted over to religion, become, ever after, its most sincere and devoted disciples; but yet those of this character, from the very constitution of their minds, can hardly be brought into the Christian church, except through influences like those of art. Shall we not, then, do something for this great class of minds? If it be our wish and purpose, as it is our duty, to extend genuine Christianity as widely as possible, we should employ means that will reach and influence every variety of temperament and character, and should be willing to spend our money and to "preach the word" in this æsthetical way, as well as in the way of oral discourse. We should throw around our worship all the attractions of art, and thus connect and identify the earliest and choicest of each rising generation with the institutions and exercises of the Christian religion.

We shall close our article with a few general remarks on the relation, which the principal sects in our country sustain to the æsthetical arts, and the use of these, which their several creeds and principles authorize and involve.

That denomination in our midst, which boasts of tracing back its faith and lineage to the pilgrim fathers—we mean the Calvinistic Orthodox of New England, and we may join with them their twin brother in faith, the "old school" Presbyterian sect of the South—holds to such a system of doctrines as would legitimately exclude from the exercises and accompaniments of devotion every thing attractive and lovely. The dark and frowning architecture of Egypt should furnish the fitting shrines for such a theology; black terror and hate and Hades should be frescoed over the church-walls dedicated to its service, and solemn, lugubrious strains eke out the doleful burden of

Digitized by Google

its anathematizing psalmody. Such, undoubtedly, would be the style of art most in consonance with the Calvinistic theory; but, as a practical characteristic, thorough-going and unhesitating allegiance to authority, allegiance to the teachings of education and ancestral tradition, is a more striking trait of the sect we are considering. What their fathers for three or five generations have believed, they are proud to believe. For aught we know, they may indeed, as they claim, retain every syllable and letter of the Puritanical creed; but they have not retained, we are sure, any too much of the Puritan spirit. That spirit of free inquiry and religious progress, which actuated the fathers of New England, and led them to repudiate not a few of the errors and superstitions of their age, finds little sympathy among those of their descendants who adhere the most strictly to their articles of faith. Had the Orthodox of our day lived at the era of the Reformation, they must, acting in their present spirit, have remained adherents of Leo X, and have denounced the doctrines of Luther and Calvin as stoutly as they now do those of Channing and Ballou. In accordance with the general spirit which we have here attributed to them, they will tolerate in their worship such religious symbols and forms alone as have been stamped with the seal of their forefathers' approbation and usage; and while, therefore, readily allowing in their churches almost every style of architecture, together with the use of the organ and the choir, for which they have ancestral sanction, they yet reprobate vehemently any like toleration to paintings and the sacred chant.

The Methodism of our land, again, is distinctively a religion of passion, impulse, and nervous impression, and is specially wanting in clear, rational conviction, and deep-rooted practical principle. Its favorite agencies are calculated to operate on the senses, considered as organs of mere sensible impression, and not as the medium of æsthetical influence. Vociferation, groans and sobs, the machinery of anxious seats, the confused mingling of preaching, praying and singing, and all its other modes of operation, are designed to agitate the nerves, rather than to convince the reason. There is really nothing æsthetic in the spirit and theory of Methodism; and we find, accordingly, nothing æsthetical in its forms and practice. Still, there are minds

Digitized by Google

for which it is eminently suited. The African race of the South, the untutored settlers of the "far West," and thousands more in every community, can be moved more effectually through direct appliances to the senses, than by any other means. Methodism, then, we admit, has its use; but yet, like Orthodoxy, it presents only a partial and one-sided semblance of what constitutes the true and complete nature and character of Christianity.

In the Catholic church, ceremonies and æsthetic symbols prevail to excess, and supersede, in too great degree, the practice of preaching and appealing directly to the reason and conscience. But still even Catholic ceremonies, excessive as they may be, are in themselves productive of good, as Madame de Staël's Corinne, De Wette's Theodore, and Dewey's "Old World and New" will abundantly show. We are not, however, here advocating the use of the fine arts in excess, or to the exclusion of preaching and prayer, but only in conjunction with these and for their assistance and reënforcement.

The most characteristic trait of the Episcopal body, under the view we are taking, is, we think, their peculiar love of decorum and propriety; and their greatest deficiency is in living conviction and earnestness of spirit. They are always ready to admit every style of art, and every species of religious emblem, but employ them, it appears to us, with too much formality and stiffness.

Unitarian moralists, on their part, present religion chiefly as an enlightened conviction of the reason, and the true regulative principle of human conduct. Reason, duty, virtue, practical goodness, — these are the watchwords repeated perpetually among the followers of Priestley and Channing; while sentiment, enthusiasm, spontaneous love, though equally important, are seldom allowed their appropriate stress. There is, thus, in the spirit of Unitarianism, very little of an æsthetical character; but yet the denomination itself has so much of high intelligence and refinement, that it would not seriously object to the introduction of any religious symbols that are sanctioned by the canons of cultivated taste, and we may, accordingly, at no distant period, expect to see the walls of Unitarian churches assume the hues of fresco, and exhibit specimens of painting among the finest and rarest to be found in the land.

Digitized by Google

Universalism, it seems to us, has not yet reached its perfect form and true position. Its preachers heretofore have devoted their main energies and efforts to the exposition and establishment of the one great doctrine of universal salvation. This has been occasioned, without doubt, and fully justified perhaps, by the peculiar circumstances of the case. The doctrine of universal restoration had been always overlooked and repudiated by the Christian church, and, in consequence, demanded, unquestionably, special attention and inculcation. But still it must not be forgotten, that, considered in itself, it is not the only or the most important doctrine of the gospel, and should not, therefore, under ordinary circumstances, occupy the whole or the chief part of the preacher's attention. That God is the *one true God*, the great Father of all, whose very being is love,—this is the grand corner-stone on which the entire fabric of Christianity reposes, and from which universal restoration and all other doctrines of scripture receive their whole support. This it is which engenders the faith that works by love and purifies the heart, and which, of itself, constitutes at once the spring of true life and religion here, and is the source and security of salvation hereafter. That the essential nature of God himself is perfect love, that Jesus Christ is the bright manifestation and medium of this love to the children of men, and that universal reconciliation is its ultimate aim and issue, are the three great truths of the Christian revelation; and if Universalism aspire to be Christianity in its full extent and genuineness, it must embrace all the great doctrines of Christ, and all in the same order and with the same relative prominence, that they hold in the gospel itself.

Let Universalism, then, give example of the true Christian catholicity and liberality. If it would gather within its embrace the whole family of believers, let it accomplish actually in religion what Cousin pretends to have accomplished in philosophy—let it acquire and maintain a character that is thoroughly eclectic, liberal, catholic; for nothing illiberal or exclusive can hope to make any stand against the advancing science and culture and enlightened sentiment of the present and coming age. Let Universalism, we repeat, tolerate and promote every thing that is true in science, and beautiful in art, and noble and good

Digitized by Google

in human life. Let it train up for its own defence and advancement such an array of thorough and liberal scholarship as shall suffice to repel sectarian exegesis and tradition from the place and prerogatives of divine revelation. Let it foster the growth of enlarged, comprehensive learning, that the treasures of modern science and the classic lore of ages may come up together to illustrate and confirm the revealed character and eternal purpose of God. Let it cherish and cultivate the keen penetration and insight of philosophic genius, that it may have always at its service and in its time of need, the means of reconciling the profoundest and the latest conclusions of human reason with the teachings of the inspired word. Let it invite literature and poetry, too, to drink from "the brook that flows fast by the oracle of God," and to assimilate their own inspiration and influence to the inspiration of the spirit of truth. And to all the various influences of this sort, let it not neglect to conjoin the service and ministry of æsthetical art. True Christian art is but the handmaid of Christian piety. Why not, then, be ready to accept and employ its proffered aid? Why not, in particular, introduce architectural designs, as fast as convenient, in the place of those unshapely structures that are still so fashionable as shrines of worship? The spirit of Universalism, in its genuine, catholic form, is essentially the spirit of Christianity itself, and architecture, therefore, to accord with the genius of Universalism, must be genuine, Christian architecture. It cannot, then, be the architecture of Egypt, which, harmonizing with the Egyptian character, embodies characteristically ideas of the strong, the gloomy, the dreadful. It cannot be the graceful architecture of Greece — the matchless paragon of stately, symmetrical beauty, of quiet, majestic composure, of serene and complacent dignity. The Gothic, in short, is the only style of architecture existing, that symbolizes, to any extent, the distinctive ideas and sentiments of the Christian religion, and it is the only one, therefore, truly fitted to furnish appropriate temples for Christian worship. The general vastness of the Gothic cathedral, and its internal perspective effect, so directly and perpetually suggestive of immensity and eternity; its ordinary form, a grand transcript of the great Christian symbol, the cross of

Digitized by Google

the crucified; its lofty spire soaring up, like the Christian's faith, into the realms of ether and light, and pointing on to unseen regions beyond; its thick-crowded towers, turrets, pinnacles, mounting confusedly upward and heavenward —like the soul's aspirations after imperishable beauty and truth — and yet all mounting up in the most ethereal, airy lightness and frailness, like humanity on earth, so frail and dependent in itself, while rising nevertheless to a destiny grander than the universe of space; and, within, that softened, shadowy, misty light that struggles in through the painted glass, significant to the Christian of the tremulous light that reaches him from that mysterious land, which "eye hath not seen, ear heard, nor the heart of man been able to conceive;" such, among others, are the striking and appropriate traits of this most Christian creation of architectural genius. Those who denounce so vehemently the style of architecture we are considering, cannot, assuredly, have seen its noblest specimens. That the church of St. Sophia at Constantinople, and the cathedrals of Germany in the region of the Rhine, are genuine, matchless lessons of Christian truth, is the confession alike of Greek, Roman and Protestant believers. To us, indeed, the Gothic cathedral seems a symbol surprisingly appropriate of Christian life and experience in our imperfect, transitional state; and, if this be so, it cannot fail of popularity and favor in a community that is, in reality, both Christian and refined. And if Christian architecture come into favor, may not Christian painting, too, and sculpture be allowed a place in the temples of religion? It certainly cannot harm us to behold, Sabbath after Sabbath, the sublime history of Christianity, spread out before us in visible enactment. If the divine excellence and loveliness that shone so brightly in the Son of man, can be reclothed in material vestments and bodied forth to the eye of flesh, with ever so little of their pristine beauty, it cannot but help to draw our attention to them, and to quicken and deepen our love and reverence for their great Exemplar. The sight of mementoes like these, at entering the church, will, all the better, predispose the mind to holy contemplation and devout feeling, and will serve as a prelude to prepare the soul for the exalted performances of the consecrated day. Finally, may we not introduce also

Digitized by Google

among the exercises of worship the use of the sacred chant? Music is the language of the soul, and the chant is, preëminently, the religious dialect of music. If the form of chant that is heard in the Swedenborgian Church, were once introduced into Universalist worship, it would give, we know, universal satisfaction. Those gentle swellings that come pouring on the soul like the soft breathings of spring, those rolling waves of melody, exalt the heart and inspire it, as the music of seraphs imparadised.

The views that have been set forth in the foregoing article, may, perhaps, be considered unsound and heretical; but, whether true or false, they have not been conceived or presented with any heretical purpose. What we are urging is, simply, to give, as far as practicable, a religious direction and use to all the various influences around us; that so, philosophy and science and learning and art, may work together in concurrence with the practical energies of pious zeal and disinterested devotion, for the establishment and extension of a genuine gospel faith, and for the spiritual edification of the present and coming generations of men. S.

Note by the Editor. This article is in itself, perhaps, sufficiently guarded against misconstruction, especially since it defines beauty so as expressly to include the abstract and purely spiritual kind, as well as the sensible. It may not be unseasonable, however, to remark, that a taste for what is commonly called the beautiful, in art or even in physical nature, can never be made the conscious ground of religious devotion. If used for this purpose, it can produce only an *amateur* piety, a *dilettantism* in religion, which, as in every thing else, corrupts and putrefies, and in the end becomes worse than acknowledged irreligion. We make this remark, not to correct any thing in the article, but to prevent an abuse, of which there is danger in ardent minds that are highly susceptive of æsthetical influences. We have sometimes known the attempt made to commend religion on the ground of the beauty of its forms and ideas. This is as absurd as another motive we have heard used: that the service of God ought to be attended to, because it is the cheapest way of keeping up social order,—a sort of economical substitute for a police. The fact may be true, so far as it goes; but who would think of trying to become religious, *for this reason?* By the very laws of human action, such a motive would make him only *pretend* to

Digitized by Google

be religious, just so far as it should seem necessary to effect his object, the maintenance of public order. On the other hand, too, if he were moved only by his taste for the beautiful, the gratification of this taste would be his real and sole aim. In all cases, to make men religious, their religious sentiment must be addressed. They must, indeed, be addressed through various mediums; but the mediums should never be confounded with the end.

Art. XIII.

Medicine for the Heart.

"Is there no balm in Gilead? is there no physician there?"—Jeremiah viii. 22.

What for the fevered heart?—Soft dews are flinging
  Coolness and sleep upon the burning brow
Of weary toil, and gentle hands are bringing
  A cup of balm to pulses weak and low;
Forest and valley, gloomy mine and mountain
  Pour out their treasures to relieve and save;
Earth everywhere sends forth a healing fountain,
  For parched lips, a respite from the grave;—
    What, for the fevered *heart?*

The helpless heart! Who has not heard its sobbings
  When all its fondest hopes, like dreams, depart?
Who has not marked its wild, tumultuous throbbings,
  When trust betrayed stings like the poisoned dart?
Sick, faint, beside the tomb it kneels forsaken,
  Or the lone midnight veils its anguish deep,
When love's long-smothered yearnings *will* awaken,
  And call for those who cannot break their sleep;—
    What for this tortured heart?

O, where the ore, the herb, the cup of healing,
  To still its pulse, and soothe its restless pain,
And bid its tide of ever-desolate feeling
  In calm and healthful music flow again?
Earth knows it not;—earth has no charm, transmuting
  Grief and despair and agony to peace,
No spell to lay the past, nor word, saluting,
  With blessed promise that all pain shall cease,
    The worn and suffering heart!

Thou weary heart! There is a fountain, swelling
  In solemn solitudes that none may tread,
Save with pure spirit in the bosom dwelling,
  With truthful lip, and meek and reverent head.

Digitized by Google

Seek thou that fountain! But to souls, uplifted
By their own strength, its wave was never known,
And seldom have the gay and worldly-gifted
Deigned to secure its healing draught their own;
Yet seek it, desolate heart!

Drink of that precious well, so pure, so lowly —
Drink, and the fever-fiends at length shall flee,
And grief itself shall wear a mien so holy,
Thou wilt not murmur though it stay with thee.
Aye, 't is the life-stream! There, immortal spirit,
Drink, and earth's ills shall vex thy rest no more;
But glorious thoughts of all thou shalt inherit,
When death shall lead thee to the blessed shore,
Shall calm the troubled heart!

L. J. B. C.

Art. XIV.

Literary Notices.

1. Memoranda of the Experience, Labors and Travels of a Universalist Preacher. Written by Himself. Cincinnati: John A. Gurley, Publisher. 1845. 12mo. pp. 400.

Does any body wish to read a book full of anecdote, conversation, shrewd portraitures of religious manners, experience and character, under different phases of religion, sketches of common life in various parts of the United States, theological arguments, and exemplifications of the moral results of different systems of Christianity; all given with a quiet but somewhat broad humor, with just enough of egotism to serve as a central point, and thus to bring the whole into unity? Would any body like such a work? Let him get the "Memoranda," and he will do, as we have just done, — read it straight through; which is more than we can say of most works of this class. We never yet have had the superhuman, or sub-human, patience to read one quarter of Murray's Life, in course, "*frae end to end.*" But in the memoir before us, we have found no call on our patience, and, bating a little coloring of the marvellous thrown over certain coincidences, no tax on common sense. It is not a book of travels, though it describes the author's excursions, from Philadelphia, some hundred miles westward and northward, and his journeys to Ohio, and thence through much of the "West," as well as into New England. It is not a polemical treatise, yet it abounds with hints in theological discussion and controversy; it is not a review of the Christian sects with which the author came in contact, though

Digitized by Google

it exhibits their peculiarities in pretty strong yet true light; it is not a series of autobiographical "Confessions," though it discloses without reserve the changes in his own mind, and sometimes dissects freely enough the complicated motives of his life. It is no one of these in particular, but all of them in general, — a wilderness of variety, with little arrangement, except such as the course of the narrative happened to suggest.

To us, the most interesting portions of the work are the accounts of the circumstances under which Universalism often springs up in its new fields; of the early state of its societies and the treatment its believers receive; and of the condition, manners and enterprise of its preachers at the West. In these respects, it will hereafter become an important historical document, recording, as it does, or rather, *Daguerreotyping*, the beginnings of our denomination in several of the States in the Mississippi Valley. It often recalls to our recollection certain scenes we have witnessed in the early stage of our progress among "the common people," in some parts of New England. Thanks to the pencil that has seized these fleeting shades of expression, and fixed them upon the canvass, before they had passed away forever!

The work pretends to no literary excellence; still, it is written in an easy, familiar style, and, for the most part, with an agreeable simplicity. The author evidently has a quick and clear insight into human character, and so hearty an enjoyment in the observation of men and manners, that, even when they are unpleasant, he cannot be angry with them.

2. Journey to Ararat. By Dr. Friedrich Parrot, Professor of Natural Philosophy in the University of Dorpat, Russian Imperial Councillor of State, &c. With Map and Wood-Cuts. Translated by W. D. Cooley. New York: Harper & Brothers, Publishers, 82 Cliff street. 1846. 12mo. pp. 389.

A PECULIAR interest will ever belong to Professor Parrot's ascent of Ararat, not only on account of his high reputation as a scientific traveller, but especially from the circumstance that he was the first, since the time of Noah, to stand on the summit of that mountain. Indeed, we infer, from a remark in the translator's preface, that his yet remains, to this day, the only ascent of which there is a particular account; though it is said that M. Autonomoff, another Russian traveller, succeeded in reaching the top, five years afterwards, or in 1834. But till the visit of M. Parrot, "the silvery head" of Ararat had stood untouched, an object of hopeless admiration to the curious traveller, and to the Armenian Christians a sacred, awful mystery, — as it is still held by them. For they continue devoutly to regard it as inac-

Digitized by Google

cessible; it having been revealed to one of their ancient saints that all access is forbidden by a divine decree, lest the remains of the ark should be profaned by mortal eye.

The central portion of Armenia is intersected (it is hardly proper to say watered,) by the Aras, the ancient Araxes; on both sides of which, stretches out the great plain, like one of the Russian *steppes*, about thirty-five miles wide from north to south, and seventy miles, or more, in length, following the river southeastwardly. At the western end, around the upper tributaries of the Aras, it is a very elevated tract; and even at the meridian of Ararat, it is 2900 feet higher than the sea, — all bare of trees and shrubs, and covered only with grass, which is burnt up, in summer, by the drought. Near the southern border of this great plain, Mount Ararat towers to the height of 14,300 feet from its base, or 17,210 feet above the sea-level; its upper part, about one fifth of the whole, sheeted with perpetual snow. It consists of two mountains, the Great and the Little Ararat, the summits of which are seven miles apart, with a wide grassy valley, or pasture-tract, between them. The latter is southeast of the former, and, though more than 4000 feet lower, is generally capped with snow. It was not till after two ineffectual attempts, up the northeast side, that M. Parrot reached the top of the Greater, or Ararat proper, from the same direction, on the 9th of October, 1829. The summit, and the prospect from it, are thus described:

"I found myself on a gently vaulted, nearly cruciform surface, of about 200 paces in circuit, which at the margin sloped off precipitously on every side, but particularly towards the southeast and northeast. Formed of eternal ice, without rock or stone to interrupt its continuity, it was the austere silvery head of Old Ararat. Towards the east, this summit extended more uniformly than elsewhere, and in this direction it was connected by means of a flattish depression, covered in like manner with perpetual ice, with a second and somewhat lower summit, distant apparently from that on which I stood above half a mile, but in reality only 397 yards, or less than a quarter of a mile. This saddle-shaped depression may be easily recognized from the plain of the Araxes with the naked eye; but from that quarter it is seen foreshortened. . . . . This may be supposed to be the very spot on which Noah's ark rested, if the summit itself be assumed as the scene of that event, for there is no want of the requisite space. . . . . From the summit I had a very extensive prospect, in which, however, owing to the great distances, only the chief masses could be plainly distinguished. The valley of the Araxes was covered in its whole length by a grayish cloud of vapor, through which Erivan and Sardarabad, [two cities thirty-five miles north,] appeared only as dark spots no bigger than my hand. In the south, the hills behind which Bayazed, [a city twenty miles off,] lay were more distinctly visible. In the north-northwest, the serrated head of Alaghés, [fifty or sixth

Digitized by Google

miles distant,] rose majestically, covered in every hollow with large masses of snow — a truly inaccessible crown of rocks. Immediately in the neighborhood of Ararat, particularly towards the southeast, and on the west at a greater distance, were a number of smaller mountains, for the most part having conical summits, with hollows in the middle, apparently at one time volcanoes. Then towards the east-southeast was the Little Ararat, the head of which no longer appeared as the simple termination of a cone, as it seemed from the plain, but like the section of a quadrangular pyramid, having at its angles and in the middle a number of rocky elevations of various heights. One thing surprised me not a little, and that was to see a large portion of Lake Gokchai, its surface of beautiful dark blue glimmering distinctly in the northeast, [sixty or seventy miles off,] behind the high mountains which enclose the lake immediately on the south, and are so elevated that I never should have thought it possible to catch a glimpse, looking over them from the top of Ararat, of the waters they imbosom."—pp. 191–194.

M. Parrot had long contemplated this journey and ascent. About eighteen years before, or in 1811, while standing on Kasbec, one of the highest summits of the Caucasus, "during a snow storm, a momentary break in the clouds discovered, in the distant south, a high, round, solitary peak, — in all probability the silver crown of Ararat," more than two hundred miles off. At length, the time came, he says, to gratify his long-suppressed aspiration after the mysterious mountain; and on the 11th of April, 1829, he left Dorpat, in Livonia, attended by several scientific gentlemen to assist in the expedition. They crossed the Don at New Tcherkask, explored the course of the river Manitch between the Black and the Caspian Seas, passed through the Caucasian Range, visited Tiflis and the adjacent villages, and thence proceeded straight to Ararat, by the way of the celebrated monastery of Echmiadzin. His little work, the result of their observations, abounds in facts geographical, geological, and botanical, as well as historical; and a number of important scientific papers are given in the Appendix. The thanks of the reading public are due to the American publishers for the choice they have made in selecting so valuable a book.

Ararat is manifestly of volcanic origin; and in 1840, a violent earthquake, which shook Armenia, precipitated a huge mass of ice and snow and mud, from the mountain, in a stream seven miles wide, in some places eighty or one hundred feet deep, and extending twelve or fourteen miles in the valley of the Aras. In this convulsion, the snowy summit of Ararat sank considerably, but did not fall in, as was at first reported.

NOTE. The writer of Art. IX. on "The Death-Penalty," wishes us to say that, since it was put in the hands of the printer, he has found that some of its arguments had already been presented in a similar manner by Br. O. A. Skinner, in the Universalist Miscellany for Dec. last. That No. of the Miscellany had not reached him, when the present article was sent to the Quarterly.

Digitized by Google

Art. XV.

War.—Personal Injury.

What is war? It is a murderous contest between human governments; in which hostile nations, or smaller communities, are encouraged and required by their respective rulers to commit mutual assault, robbery, rapine, and slaughter. War has caused the destruction, according to Edmund Burke, of 35,000,000,000, and according to Dr. Dick, of 14,000,000,000 of human beings; the lowest estimate being enough to people eighteen planets like the earth with its present numbers; and their blood would fill a harbor of sufficient capacity to contain the combined navies of the world. Nevertheless, it is still solemnly authorized, systematically taught, expensively provided for, and implicitly relied on, as their dernier resort, by all nations. War is the chief concern of governments. They bestow more care and money upon it, than on any other department of public affairs. Politics worship in its sanctuary. Patriotism laps the blood of its sacrifices. Wealth holds fast by the horns of its gory altar. Beauty dances at its festivals. The muses minister in its fanes. Rhetoric, poetry, and music throw their enchantment over its horrors. Painting and sculpture do it homage. Literature makes shrines for its temples. Religion consecrates its banners, blesses its gaudy parades, and celebrates with *Te Deum* its murderous triumphs. Reverend hands hold up the rod of its strength, and mitred heads bow their awful Amen to its desolating decrees. And yet all these devotees affect to deprecate war, and desire its abolition! They are all in favor of peace — universal, everlasting peace. They are for war only as a resort of dire necessity, to secure an honorable peace. Such are their usual protestations!

But there are those who pronounce all war, defensive as well as offensive, antichristian. There are others who go a step farther, and pronounce all inflictions of injury by man on man, whether offensive or defensive, antichristian. The former are commonly denominated Peacemen; the latter, Non-Resistants. Both propositions rest

Digitized by Google

on the same foundation, and must stand or fall together. The only important difference between them is, that one illustrates an application of their common principle to international war, and the other to all interhuman injury.

Non-Resistants are so denominated, not because they hold to absolute passivity, to non-resistance in *all* respects; but in this only, that between human beings injury is never to be opposed or resisted with injury. They hold to the use of moral and physical forces which are demonstrably salutary to all parties concerned. They object to no moral or physical restraints employed for the public good, or for individual protection, provided they be not personally injurious to those upon whom they are exercised. And they mean, by the terms *injury*, *injurious*, &c., to designate every act or process of treatment, which destroys life, or impairs any of its functions, or which impairs the intellectual faculties, or depraves the moral nature. Every such act or treatment of man to man, they pronounce antichristian; whether proceeding from individuals, combinations, or governments; whether ostensibly in defence of national honor or independence, or for the preservation of law and order in society, or for the protection of personal life, rights, property or reputation. Their doctrine is, total abstinence from the infliction of injury by man on man.

The writer of this article avows himself a Non-Resistant, and desires in the spirit of candor to offer a few reasons in support of that very unpopular, much misunderstood, and sadly misrepresented doctrine. In so doing, he can find no occasion to oppose or disparage the sublime doctrines of universal love and grace, to the advocacy of which this periodical is professedly devoted. On the contrary, he is sure that all who truly worship God as "love," as the universal Father; all who recognize the essential brotherhood of the human race, in their common nature, moral dereliction from duty, spiritual wants, and hopes of salvation, will see, in Christian non-resistance, only a practical illustration of their Saviour's injunction, "I say unto you, Love your enemies, bless them that curse you, do good to them that hate you, and pray for them which despitefully use you and persecute you; that ye may be the children of your Father which is in heaven." Surely, then, it

Digitized by Google

becomes those who profess to bow to such a law and to embrace such principles, to consider whether they are acting in accordance with them; to consider especially whether, if they practise or approve the infliction of absolute injury, even on the worst of human beings, they are worthy to be called the children of the Highest!

In discussing the subject, let us first determine the precise point at issue. I understand it to be thus: whether, on one hand, all war and all personal injury, between human beings, is antichristian? Or, on the other, whether all war and all personal injury between human beings, *except defensive*, is antichristian? It is admitted by anti-non-resistants of the respectable classes, that *offensive* war, and *aggressive* injury are always antichristian. It is admitted that war and injury, *in retaliation*, is antichristian. But nations may go to war, it is said, in self-defence; society may inflict deadly, or less injurious, penalties on criminals, by due process of law, in self-defence; and individuals, not otherwise adequately protected, may destroy life, or inflict any other personal injury on their assailants, in self-defence. All this is compatible with Christian morality, nay, is a Christian duty. Wars of self-defence, and inflictions of personal injury in self-defence, are right, are Christian. This cannot be misunderstood. On the non-resistant side, it is not denied that self-defence by Christian means is right. It is not denied that nations, that society, that individuals, may use both moral and physical force, not extending to personal injury, in rightful self-defence. But it is affirmed that personal injury can never be rightfully inflicted even in self-defence, either by nations in the form of war, or by society through the processes of law, or by individuals with direct violence. Such means of self-defence are pronounced antichristian. This, then, is the point at issue: Are wars, fightings, injurious punishments, inflictions of personal injury, in self-defence, right? Are they justifiable according to the law of God, as declared and exemplified by Jesus Christ? If they are, non-resistance is an absurdity. But if they are not, it is a divine truth, and the imperative duty of all who profess to honor Christ as the Son of God.

Now, how shall we settle this question? First, let us

Digitized by Google

be sure that we clearly understand the doctrine of injurious self-defence. What may a man, a community, or a nation defend? 1, life; 2, liberty; 3, rights, essential to happiness. Property and reputation must be included in these rights. The undisturbed enjoyment of these rights is necessary to human happiness. Whenever these are threatened, a man, a community, a nation, may resort to the use of any kind or degree of personal injury (from wholesale destruction in war, to the infliction of a stripe or a flesh-bruise) which in the judgment of the endangered party is necessary to self-defence. Here are several important points to be judged of. 1. How far these natural rights extend. 2. How far they are endangered. 3. How much injury shall be inflicted to preserve them. These are very nice points to settle. The most enlightened and dispassionate minds would often be at fault in settling them. But instead of such judges to sit on every case, the doctrine before us makes every man judge in his own case *ex parte*, every community its own judge *ex parte*, and every nation. Amidst alarm, suspicion, passion, self-interest, and every other unfavorable circumstance, human nature sits in judgment on its own rights, its own dangers, and its own measures of resistance. What are the consequences of such *ex parte* judgments? That, in nine cases out of ten, men assume that their rights extend much farther than they do; that they claim liberty to overreach and oppress; that they call *that* their property, to which they have in fact no right in equity; that they set up extravagant notions of honor; that they imagine themselves insulted, injured, or in great danger, with little or no cause at all; that they strike before they are struck; that they provoke the very ill-will and mischief they suspect, by assuming an attitude of armed defiance; and that when they have got well engaged in what they call self-defence, they almost invariably plunge into the grossest retaliation, and even aggression. Both parties misjudge on all these points; both parties grow more and more reckless; and justify themselves in all the wickedness of war to the very sword-hilt, on the ground of self-defence. It has been so in all past ages. It must, from the very nature of things, be so through all future ages, while human nature is human nature, and is judge in its own cause *ex parte*,

Digitized by Google

under such blinding and delusive influences. If moderate drinking naturally trains men for intemperance, does not this specious moderate *injuring* as naturally train them for cruelty and outrage? These facts and considerations give the whole doctrine of injurious self-defence a dark and doubtful aspect. They render it improbable that Jesus Christ, in developing the highest and purest goodness, should sanction a discretionary power so liable to intolerable abuse. They afford a strong presumption that he must have prohibited so mischievous a discretion in man, to slaughter *ad libitum* his fellow-creatures under the plea of self-defence. But how shall we determine the matter? What did he teach? What was his spirit? What was his example? What did his apostles teach? What was the practice of the faithful primitive Christians? Will not available historic testimony on these points settle our main question? Let us seek that testimony.

The records of the New Testament Scriptures are ample and explicit. "Ye have heard that it hath been said, (see Exodus xxi. 23–25; Leviticus xxiv. 17–20; Deut. xix. 21,) an eye for an eye, and a tooth for a tooth. But I say unto you, that ye resist not evil, [that is, with personal injury;] but whosoever shall smite thee on thy right cheek, turn to him the other also. And if any man will sue thee at the law, and take away thy coat, let him have thy cloak also." "I say unto you, Love your enemies, bless them that curse you, do good to them that hate you, and pray for them which despitefully use you and persecute you; that ye may be the children of your Father which is in heaven; for he maketh his sun to rise on the evil and on the good, and sendeth his rain on the just and on the unjust. For if ye love them [only] who love you, what reward have you? Do not even the publicans the same? . . . . Be ye therefore perfect, even as your Father which is in heaven is perfect." (Matt. v. 38–40, 43–48.) "After this manner therefore pray ye, ... Forgive us our debts as we forgive our debtors." "For if ye forgive men their trespasses, your heavenly Father will also forgive you. But if ye forgive not men their trespasses, neither will your Father forgive your trespasses." (Matt. vi. 12, 14, 15.) "Then came Peter to him, and said, Lord, how oft shall my brother trespass against me, and I forgive

Digitized by Google

him? Till seven times? Jesus saith unto him, I say not unto thee, until seven times, but until seventy times seven." (Matt. xviii. 21, 22.) "Put up again thy sword into his place: for all they that take the sword shall perish with the sword." (Matt. xxvi. 52.) "Ye know not what manner of spirit ye are of. For the Son of Man is not come to destroy men's lives but to save them." (Luke ix. 55, 56.) "My kingdom is not of this world: If my kingdom were of this world, then would my servants fight, that I should not be delivered to the Jews: but now is my kingdom not from hence." (John xviii. 36.) "Bless them which persecute you; bless and curse not." "Recompense to no man evil for evil." "Dearly beloved, avenge not yourselves, but rather give place unto wrath; for it is written, Vengeance is mine, I will repay, saith the Lord. Therefore if thine enemy hunger, feed him; if he thirst, give him drink; for in so doing thou shall heap coals of fire on his head. Be not overcome of evil, but overcome evil with good." (Rom. xii. 14, 17, 19, 21.) "Dare any of you, having a matter against another, go to law before the unjust, and not before the saints?" "Is it so, that there is not a wise man among you? No, not one that shall be able to judge between his brethren? But brother goeth to law with brother, and that before the unbelievers. [It is just so in our times.] Now, therefore, there is utterly a fault among you, because ye go to law one with another. Why do ye not rather take wrong? Why do ye not rather suffer yourselves to be defrauded?" (1 Cor. vi. 1, 5–7.) "This is thankworthy, if a man for conscience toward God endure grief, suffering wrongfully. For what glory is it, if when ye be buffeted for your faults, ye shall take it patiently? but if, when ye do well, and suffer for it, ye take it patiently, this is acceptable with God. For even hereunto were ye called; because Christ also suffered for us, leaving us an example that ye should follow his steps; who did no sin, neither was guile found in his mouth; who when he was reviled, reviled not again; when he suffered, he threatened not; but committed himself to him that judgeth righteously." (1 Peter ii. 19–23.) "He that saith he abideth in Him, ought himself also so to walk, even as he walked." (1 John ii. 6.) "Now if any man have not the spirit of Christ, he is none of his." (Rom. viii. 9.)

Digitized by Google

How did Christ act? What was his example? How did he live and die? Did he ever injure, even an enemy, in self-defence? No. When, in his defence, Peter smote the high-priest's servant, and cut off his ear, Jesus stayed his defensive violence, and healed the injured assailant; saying, "Put up again thy sword into his place: for all they that take the sword, shall perish with the sword." "He was led as a lamb to the slaughter, and as a sheep dumb before her shearers, so he opened not his mouth." Did he seek an earthly throne and crown? No; he eschewed all participation in the human governments of his time. He would be no judge or divider. He would not order the guilty adulteress executed, though he alone was without sin; but mercifully said, "Go and sin no more." He sought no place among the courtiers and military favorites of worldly power. He was a stranger in palaces and camps. He declared that "the Son of Man came not to be ministered unto, but to minister to others, and to give his life a ransom for many." When scourged, mocked, spit upon and subjected to every indignity, he remained firm in his meekness and love. And on the cross, in the agonies of expiring nature, his non-resistant perfection tenderly breathed itself forth in prayer for his murderers, "Father forgive them; for they know not what they do." Well did the admiring, though antichristian philosopher affirm that "Socrates died like a man, but Jesus like a God."

And how was it with his apostles? How was it with the primitive Christians down to the third century? They were "as sheep in the midst of wolves," enjoined to be "wise as serpents and harmless as doves." Never, from the time Peter was commanded to put up his sword in Gethsemane, have we any intimation that those faithful primitive disciples lifted up a deadly weapon even in self-defence. Their language and conduct was, "Though we walk in the flesh, we do not war after the flesh: for the weapons of our warfare are not carnal, but mighty through God to the pulling down of strong holds; casting down imaginations, and every high thing that exalteth itself against the knowledge of God, and bringing into captivity every thought to the obedience of Christ." (2 Cor. x. 3–5.) "We are fools for Christ's sake. . . . . Being reviled, we

Digitized by Google

bless; being persecuted, we suffer it; being defamed, we entreat. We are made as the filth of the world, the off-scouring of all things to this day." (1 Cor. iv. 10–13.) "But God hath chosen the foolish things of the world to confound the wise, ... the weak things of the world to confound things which are mighty; and base things of the world, and things which are despised, hath God chosen, and things which are not, to bring to nought the things which are; that no flesh should glory in his presence." (1 Cor. i. 27–29.) In all this they felt no consciousness of meanness and degradation. On the contrary, they appreciated the moral exaltation and excellency of their high calling. They rejoiced in worldly privation and contempt. They magnified their sublime mission. They acted as those who belonged to a kingdom not of this world, whose office it was to be "the salt of the earth," and "the light" of their age. Therefore, though they patiently submitted to the idolatrous and military governments of their time, even to the greatest wrongs, they conscientiously declined all official station and all voluntary participation in those governments. They refused to serve in their armies, or to be trained to the arts of war; and, in some instances, suffered death at the hands of military tyranny, rather than act as soldiers; reiterating even in death the declaration, "*I am a Christian, and cannot fight.*" All this is susceptible of ample historic proof. It was not till corruption and apostasy had become rooted in the growing church, that Christians were seen in the Roman armies. I hold these statements to be incontrovertible.

Now in view of the precepts of Jesus and his apostles, in view of their example, followed up so conscientiously by the primitive disciples down to the third century; and in view of that spirit which characterizes unadulterated Christianity wherever it is illustrated by true souls, how can we avoid the conclusion, that injurious self-defence, in all its forms, is antichristian? Let any professing Christian, at all imbued with the humility, compassion and heavenly-mindedness of the Saviour, just withdraw himself from all false positions in society, and plant himself as an individual soul on truly Christian ground, and then must he not come to this conclusion? Unfortunately many, who might otherwise see the truth on this subject,

Digitized by Google

have so tied themselves up and identified themselves with the antichristian institutions of society and government, that they see all things through a false medium,—through worldly spectacles. Consequently, though professedly the ardent admirers of love, and though avowing their earnest desire for the reign of universal peace and good will among men, they regard Christian non-resistance as an absurdity, and as one of the chief errors of our times. They pronounce it impracticable to maintain order and human rights without the aid of deadly physical force. From this assumption they proceed to argue against the non-resistant construction of the precepts of the gospel. We have great veneration for the Bible, say they, and believe that its precepts are divine. If, however, they are divine, they cannot be impracticable; and, consequently, they should receive no interpretation which would make them destroy the true interests of society. If literally interpreted, the precept which says, Resist not evil, prohibits the moral as well as the physical resistance of evil. Such an interpretation, all would say, is forced; but is it more so, than that which would make it prohibit all physical resistance of evil? Can it mean that I am not to hold back the assassin who would murder my children? Or the incendiary who would burn my dwelling? Or the man who casts about firebrands, arrows and death? It is impious to say that one who loved right and justice, as the Master did, ever gave a precept containing such prohibitions. The truth is, the precept in question was not designed for a general rule; but was given to his early followers, as their guide, when wronged by the tyrants under whom they lived. To resist them would be of no avail; it was better, therefore, patiently to endure.

Such, very nearly, is the reasoning made use of to avoid the force of our Lord's strongest non-resistant precepts. It is ingenious, but is it sound? Let us examine it. It begins with the assertion that no divine precept can be impracticable. This is true in point of fact, but not so true in its intended application. Is it meant that all divine precepts are equally practicable, to all men under all circumstances? If so, who is to be judge in the case? Am I to determine that any certain precept, purporting to be divine, is really so, by first determining whether it is prac-

Digitized by Google

ticable? And am I to take for granted that it is impracticable, because I cannot, in *my* circumstances, act to it without risking my life or some of my natural rights? Or, if the proposed precept is extremely difficult for me in my peculiar circumstances, as compared with precepts already submitted to, may I conclude that it is impracticable? For instance, it is easy for me, as I am situated, to abstain from murder, from theft, and from sacrilege, but extremely difficult for me not to covet, and not to bear false witness. I am so situated that obedience to some precepts is easy and advantageous to my present interests; I have no temptation to violate them. But other precepts are extremely difficult for me, and unless I take a new position, which will require me to run great risks of present ease, advantage or pleasure, they are to me impracticable. If I am the owner of an extensive distillery, for which I am considerably in debt, and have an expensive family, requiring the large profits of an immoral business to sustain me, it becomes very impracticable for me to take the temperance pledge. May I therefore conclude that it is not my duty? To another, it is very easy, very practicable. Is it therefore his duty? I am a slaveholder, with a large cotton plantation, and hundreds of bondmen to till my fields. As I have been educated, and as I have brought up my family, and as my slaves have been managed, it seems to me impossible to do unto them as I would that they should do unto me. I see nothing but ruin to them and myself in the emancipation. Shall I therefore conclude that the precept, "All things whatsoever ye would that others should do unto you, do ye also unto them," is not divine, merely because, to me, in my circumstances, it seems so utterly impracticable? I am a governor of some state or province, and, as such, commander-in-chief of all its military and naval forces. I cause those forces to be thoroughly equipped and trained in time of peace for war. I maintain a suspicious, defiant attitude towards other States, who do the same towards mine. At length some trespass or insult is committed on my people, and war follows. I am now for war in self-defence, that is, in defence of something deemed essential to the welfare of my country. In this posture of affairs, I am reminded that Jesus enjoins on all his professed followers, not to

Digitized by Google

resist injury with injury, but if smitten on one cheek to offer the other, rather than smite back again; to love their enemies, bless those who curse them, and do good to those that hate them; to forgive the trespasses of offenders until seventy times seven, rather than injure them even justly, &c. All this to me, under existing circumstances, seems as impracticable, as God's command to sacrifice Isaac did to Abraham of old. May I therefore conclude that these are not divine precepts? Would it be proper for me to say, I have great veneration for the Bible, and believe its precepts divine. But if they are divine, they cannot be impracticable. These precepts are impracticable for me and my countrymen, as we are now situated, and therefore they cannot be divine? Is this the way for me to determine the divine authority of moral precepts? If so, is there one precept in the Bible which has not, at some time, by some people, been invalidated? This test of practicability is a very impracticable one, in human hands. Men first place themselves in false positions, where it is extremely difficult, for the time being, to do right; and then plead that a duty urged upon them cannot be their duty, because it is impracticable. And to them it is impracticable only because it imposes on them a greater cross than they are willing to bear, even though that same cross is sure to be followed by a crown of happiness. Nations and individuals generally determine any course of conduct to be impracticable which requires meekness, long-suffering, forgiveness and absolute non-injury to their enemies. They cannot see that it is always safest, as well as most God-like, to be harmless and benevolent towards others, whether *they* are so or not. They cannot bear the disgrace of excelling their enemies in goodness. They are afraid they shall be killed, or robbed, or in some way injured, unless they can make themselves as terrible in the work of destruction as their assailants. They rely, for self-defence, on compelling or frightening their evil-minded fellow-creatures to keep at a respectful distance. Is this the Christianity of the New Testament? I cannot think it is. I therefore conclude that what Christ plainly enjoined as the duty of his followers, what he himself illustrated by example in life and death, what his disciples practised with a good degree of fidelity and success for nearly two

Digitized by Google

hundred years, is practicable to all his sincere followers of the present age. It may be extremely difficult in some cases, but it is practicable by divine grace. This is true of all the commandments of God. It is as true of the commandment, "Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself," as it is of the precept, Resist not injury with injury. All seem impossible under some circumstances; but all are practicable by divine aid to those who try with the whole heart to obey them.

The reasoning, which I am now answering, is defective in another respect. It evades the true issue. It speaks of physical force as exercised only in a way simply protective, without being deadly or injurious. "May I not hold back the assassin who would murder my children? the incendiary who would burn my dwelling? the man who casts about firebrands, arrows and death?" Is that all you insist on,—To hold back the assassin, incendiary, and madman! Hold him back, how? By physical force, used in a harmless and friendly, though earnest, manner. This is all innocent, and justifiable, provided you neither intend, nor inflict injury on him. The harmless, friendly, physical restraint of such persons is not the thing objected to. It is not the thing prohibited by Christ. Nor is it the thing contended for by those who oppose non-resistance. The questions, to make a fair issue, should stand thus: May I not stab the assassin to the heart, dash out his brains, or do any thing else I judge necessary to the defence of myself or family? May I not beat, mangle, or kill outright the incendiary? or the man about to scatter firebrands, arrows and death, if I deem it necessary to self-defence? These are the true questions. And who does not see that any fair construction of our Lord's precepts, as already quoted in this article, makes them prohibit such violent and murderous means of self-defence? The old saying was, life for life, eye for eye, &c. "But," says Jesus, "I say unto you, that ye resist not evil." How? As the old saying allowed, by taking life for life, eye for eye, &c. What then? "But whosoever shall smite thee on thy right cheek, turn to him the other also." Endure to be smitten again and again, rather than inflict such injuries in self-defence. Self-defence is the very point touched by this part of the precept. Jesus does not

Digitized by Google

address the injurer, but the *injured* one; not the assailant, but the assailed. And the defendant is enjoined not to smite back. The *aggressor* needed no new precept. He already knew himself forbidden to injure. But the injured party had been taught that it was right to kill, or injure the offending party in self-defence. To him, therefore, the new precept was addressed. Is not the matter very plain? Christ goes against *injurious* self-defence, and retaliation, at the same time. This is true of this whole class of precepts. It is pleaded that they forbid retaliation only, while they allow nations, communities, and individuals to kill or otherwise injure in self-defence. But it is not so. All inflictions of injury, without exception, are prohibited. It is speciously argued, I know, that self-defence does nothing for the sake of injury. It has no desire to harm the aggressor, and would gladly be spared the necessity which forces it to act. Alas, the treacherous delusion! Napoleon made himself believe that he invaded Russia in self-defence. The duellist imagines that he fights, and even sends his challenge, in self-defence. Every man persuades himself, that he is acting some how in self-defence. We cannot trust self-defence with discretionary power to "kill, slay, and destroy." It runs into retaliation, and downright aggression, as water runs down hill. This is a good and sufficient reason why our heavenly Father has prohibited it. It is incompatible with the highest order of moral excellence, which Jesus declared and exemplified.

The conclusion of the objector's reasoning is also to my mind utterly inadmissible. It is this: The precept, Resist not evil, &c., was never designed for a general rule; but was given to the early disciples, as their guide, when wronged by the tyrants under whom they lived. To resist them would be of no avail; it was better, therefore, patiently to endure. Now if this be a correct view of the subject, why, after all, is not the precept a general rule? Why should not all Christians (those of our day, as well as their predecessors) consider it a rule, patiently to endure all such wrongs, oppressions, and injuries, as it would be of no avail to resist? If this is not a general rule, how long was it a special rule? Was it a special rule only to the disciples cotemporary with Christ and the apostles?

Digitized by Google

Did it not come down to the persecuted Christians of the Roman empire, and more barbarous nations? When did it cease to be in force? A little reflection must convince us that if it ever was a rule or guide at all, it is a general rule, applicable to Christians, under the same circumstances, in all ages and countries. If so, it would amount to this: Never attempt to defend yourselves against your injurers, until you are sure it will be of some avail. Then you may kill, slaughter, and destroy, in self-defence, at discretion. Did the Son of God mean to inculcate this maxim? Did he say so *small* a thing on so grave a subject? Submit to all manner of outrage while you deem resistance useless; and then fight for your lives and your rights! "Ye have heard that it hath been said, an eye for an eye, and a tooth for a tooth." But I say unto you, be careful not to act on this saying while you judge yourselves too weak to carry it out. Submit to all insults and injuries, till you become powerful enough to resist successfully. Then you may defend your persons and your rights as you judge necessary! The statement of this interpretation is its sufficient condemnation. It is derogatory to the character and principles of Christ, to construe his precepts in such a sense. He was a non-resistant, but he was no coward. Neither was he the prophet of that low, worldly expediency which makes a merit of necessity, or a virtue of cunning.

But, says the objector, I insist that your non-resistance theory is impracticable, in the present depraved state of human nature. The world has always been a wicked world. Wanton offence, aggression, and outrage have marked all ages. These are the grand causes and occasions of wars, death-penalties, and all those injuries more or less deadly, which communities and individuals have been obliged to resort to in self-defence. Remove these causes, and we may all be Peace-men and Non-resistants. At present we must defend ourselves, our families, and our rights; or all order, security, and happiness must perish out of the earth. We must fight and destroy in self-defence, or do worse. Answer. I grant that the world is wicked, that mankind are depraved, that many are prone to wanton aggression and outrage. And now what is to be done? Is the world to be made worse, or at least

Digitized by Google

kept where it is, by levelling down the good to the grade of the bad? that is, by educating them to resist injury with injury? Is the world to be cured of violence by violence? Satan to be cast out with Satan? Is evil to be overcome with evil? It cannot be done. Must we fight and resist unto death, or do worse? Who knows this? Are they Christians who take all this for granted? Bad men will fight as long as they can find good men to render fighting honorable. But need Christians fight? Cannot they live without destroying their wicked fellow-men? How did the primitive Christians multiply and prevail under the most relentless persecutions, in the non-resistant age of the church! War has caused the death of from fourteen to thirty-five thousand millions of people. Does any man believe that if all the upright and excellent of the earth had been non-resistants, greater numbers would have been killed? If a hand had never been lifted in self-defence, from the murder of Abel to this day, does any man presume that more human lives would have been destroyed, more than from fourteen to thirty-five thousand millions? It is incredible. This fighting and murdering in self-defence has only made a bad matter worse. The safety of the upright, and the peace of the world, are not promoted by any kind of injurious self-defence. War has slain ten where it has preserved one. If good men, so-called, had been better, bad men would have been fewer and less outrageous. Christianity is a deep philosophy. It prescribes the true method of overcoming evil. I cannot, therefore, give in for a moment to the assumption that, wicked as the world is, we must fight and destroy in self-defence, or do worse. Every drop of blood so shed is a seed of violence, which springs up and bears thirty-fold. But every drop of blood, drawn from non-resistant veins, is a seed of peace, a sprinkle of reconciling sacrifice for the purification of the world, an atonement between man and man. Weeping and suffering patiently for the true and the right, hasten the general regeneration of human nature. Wrath, and violence, and war, and human punishments, only retard that glorious work. We may restrain men from personal outrage by harmless moral and physical forces, when occasion requires; but let us leave punishment with God, who is certain never to injure even

Digitized by Google

by punishment itself. We are not fit to be each other's judges, or punishers. Therefore, if our enemy hunger, let us feed him; if he thirst, let us give him drink; not shoot, stab, strangle, rob, maim, or otherwise injure him! Is not this Christianity? And will not peace be secured by all who walk according to this law of love?

But, again, it is argued, that a government without destructive physical force would be no government. Under it, the lawless would commit any depredation they pleased. They could burn dwellings, and lay waste cities; and none could say to them, Villains! cease from this unholy work! An infuriated mob of a hundred men could destroy an entire nation.

Answer. I reason to a directly opposite conclusion. Let me suppose a truly Christian commonwealth, with all its appropriate institutions, laws, arrangements and influences. That commonwealth eschews entirely the use of injurious physical force, whether towards foreign or domestic disturbers of its peace. It no longer places any dependence on the sword, the halter, or any instrument of injury. It commits itself to stand by the Christian law. What will follow? No longer trusting to brute force for security, it will exert its utmost intellectual, moral, pecuniary, and industrial energy, so to educate, employ, and improve its people, that the number of the ignorant, intemperate, and vicious shall be as nothing relatively to the enlightened, moral, and orderly portion. Then there will be little to fear from within. With regard to foreigners, such a commonwealth would be so just, so respectful, so forbearing, so conciliatory, so resolved to maintain a good understanding, that war would never occur. Or, should a war of pure aggression be commenced against it, the intelligence, virtue, Christian principle and close union of its people at home, would infallibly insure them a bloodless victory. It would be hard fighting with a people too good to fight, even in self-defence; and hard conquering those who stood prepared to abide by their principles and their rights, though stripped of all their possessions. There would be no danger to such a people from enemies abroad, or mobocrats at home. Those who are so much troubled with war and mobocracy, are generally the procurers of their own mischief. They sel-

Digitized by Google

fishly neglect to use the means necessary to make a people wise, good, and happy. The military system, and generally the whole injury-inflicting machinery of government, breed villains and mobocrats. It is, therefore, much better to prevent the growth of such characters, than to be able to meet them with a drawn sword, saying, Villains! cease from this unholy work! Besides, a doubt may sometimes arise, under the present order of things, whether the punished are greater villains than some of the punishers. At all events, if our politicians and magistrates tell the truth of each other, in their scramble for office, they are not exactly the men to say to ordinary villains, "Stand off, I am holier than thou!" It may be said, Show us your true Christian commonwealth, and we will not grumble with its non-injurious government!—Give me the hearts of half our nominal Christians and Christian ministers, and I will speedily show the spectacle. But if professed Christians cannot consent to follow their Lord and Master into the practice of his non-resistance precepts, I ought not to count on the unregenerate and reprobate portion of the people. If Christians are so bound up in war and injurious self-defence, that they cannot risk their lives and property under divine protection, what hope is there of the rest of the world? If the fine gold is dim, and the salt has lost its savor, the case would seem rather cheerless; certainly, till the work of reformation shall have progressed farther. I may look back with satisfaction on the past to William Penn's settlement in the midst of warlike savages, without forts, without arms, without a train-band, and without any visible means of defence. That settlement flourished for seventy years in unbroken peace, and lost not a man, woman, or child, or even a drop of human blood by the hand of violence. But when the peace-principle was abjured by its government, war followed with all its horrors. I can point to the Irish Quakers in the bloody rebellion of the last century, who, by adhering to their principles, lost only one member, and that one an apostate. He took arms through distrust, and was slain by the rebels. I could bring up a multitude of cases of individuals wonderfully preserved under the most alarming circumstances, by fidelity to non-resistance. But I will not enter into these particulars now. I am convinced the

Digitized by Google

general rule is, They that take the sword perish with the sword; they that trust to violence and injury for defence, become the prey of violence, and they who seek peace ensure it. "Men do not gather grapes of thorns, nor figs of thistles."

When, therefore, it is confidently pleaded, that danger is on the side of non-resistance, and safety on the side of warlike, injurious self-defence, I deny the truth of the assertion, and challenge an appeal to facts. So far as experience and the records of the past speak on this point, their testimony is decidedly in favor of the safety of a peaceable and non-resistant course of conduct, both in respect to individuals and communities. But I will notice another objection.

It is said that God loves his enemies, and yet he punishes them. He forgives transgressors, yet he makes them feel the weight of his displeasure. In all his dealings, he is governed by love, yet very many and terrible are the judgments with which he visits those who disregard his laws.—I admit all this. But does God punish or inflict judgments in self-defence? Certainly not. Does he do it in retaliation? Certainly not. Does he do it for the injury of the punished? Certainly not. Does he commit the slightest error in the time, manner, spirit or amount of punishment? Certainly not. Does he judge and deal with every creature equitably, so that there is no danger that the innocent will be wronged, or the guilty escape a wise and righteous punishment? Certainly. Then what has man to do with judging and punishing the guilty? Is it *his* business? Is he qualified for the work? Is he an all-knowing, impartial, dispassionate, disinterested judge? No. It is his place to know himself, to answer for his own sins, to be ready to give account of himself, to forbear and forgive, as he hopes to be forborne with and forgiven of God. Why, then, is he so officious, by his own wisdom and terror, to govern the world? Let him learn to govern himself, and God will enable him to do his proper part towards governing others. But let him not say, God punishes and destroys, therefore I may. Let him never say this, till he can say, I am infallible in judgment, and omnipotent to make alive as well as to destroy!

It is said again, by way of objection to the doctrine of

Digitized by Google

Christian non-resistance, that every man owes a duty to himself. He is bound to exercise the reason God has given him, and to use aright all the powers with which he is endowed. Strictly speaking, his powers are God's; and he has no right to use them differently than God directs. Has he, then, a right to sacrifice them, or stand still and permit others to do it? If not, he is far from violating the law of love and forgiveness, when he feels compelled to smite him who would destroy his life.

To this, it is a sufficient answer, that God has commanded us not to preserve our earthly existence by means of deadly or injurious blows inflicted on our offenders; that our lives are hid with Christ in God; that whosoever loseth his life for Christ's sake, or, what is the same thing, for Christian principle, shall keep it unto life eternal; and that in obeying the divine commandments we are always safe. The preservation of our temporal life, our health, and other gifts of God, is our duty in subordination to higher duties. But we must be ready to lay down our lives for truth's sake, for charity's sake, and for righteousness' sake. It is base and dastardly to live, or keep our health, or preserve any ordinary enjoyments, when to do so we must disobey the divine precepts, abjure the truth, or turn our backs on perishing humanity. In doing these duties, thousands of good men have ceased to count their lives dear unto themselves, have sacrificed their health, and suffered the loss of all that worldlings hold dear. Such have only exchanged a momentary for an eternal good. The idea that it is a sin for a man to say to a blood-thirsty assailant, I cannot take your life, nor do you an injury, even to prevent your taking mine, I will sooner die under your hand than harm you,—is a self-evident error. This is the purest and noblest attitude in which a man can stand to his fellow-man. In such a spirit, with such a purpose, he triumphs, not only over death, but over his enemy, and what is more yet, over sin itself, in its most dangerous form,—over sin within himself. Such souls are already bright with the garments of immortality. If our Christian professors were near enough to the mark to meet all their injurers in such a manner, violence and crime would cease from the world. But, now, we behold these saints clenching their fists, grasping

Digitized by Google

their deadly weapons, breathing out defiance, and even asserting that it is their duty to kill their assailants to save their own lives! Alas, that the prophets should thus teach, that the priests should bear rule by their means, and that many of the people should love to have it so. It will yet be otherwise.

Again it is said, Although Christ did not resist injury, he paid tribute to the government. He said "Render to Cæsar the things that are Cæsar's," and he often pointed the rebellious Jews to the destruction which awaited them by the hands of the Romans as a punishment for their sins. If Christ was against self-defence, he reflects imperfectly the character of the infinite Father who destroyed the Jews for oppressing the Christians. Why did he not let them conquer their enemies by love? and why did he so often point to that destruction, to encourage the Christians in their heavy trials. Why did he not say, No judgment can be executed for your relief; you must work your way through all difficulties by love.

Answer. What if Jesus did pay tribute to government, is that any evidence that he approved of war, military operations, and penal injuries? If so, is it not quite as good evidence that he approved of the idolatry regularly practised and supported by the Roman government? His submission to taxation no more proves the rightfulness of injurious national and personal self-defence, than his bearing his own cross toward the place of execution proves that Herod and Pilate were righteous in delivering him up to crucifixion. It is true, Jesus said, "Render unto Cæsar the things that are Cæsar's." But he was no less truthful in saying, "Render unto God the things that are God's." The tribute money was Cæsar's; supreme love, reverence and obedience belonged to God. If, therefore, Cæsar exacted any thing contrary to the law of God, it is plain that he had no right to it, and that duty must first be performed to the supreme authority. Suppose Cæsar to have commanded a Christian to worship an idol, which God had prohibited; might God have been disobeyed for the sake of Cæsar? Or suppose Cæsar to have required a Christian to serve as a soldier in his army, but God forbade him to do so; must not God be obeyed? And if Cæsar threatened to punish that refusal with death, would it not

Digitized by Google

have been that Christian's duty to die rather than become a trained murderer? The objector thinks that if Christ forbade injurious self-defence, he but imperfectly reflected the character of the Father, who destroyed the Jews for oppressing the Christians; and asks why Christ so often pointed to that destruction to encourage the Christians under their heavy trials? Also, why he did not say to them, No judgment can be executed for your relief; you must work your way through all difficulties by love? Answer. Did God destroy the Jews in self-defence, because they persecuted his people? Why, then, did he not destroy the Romans in self-defence for the same reason? Is it true that Jesus held up the destruction of the Jews to encourage his followers under their trials? Did he work on their feelings by assuring them that their enemies were soon to be destroyed? Did he make this a ground of encouragement? Is it true that God destroyed the Jews particularly on account of their oppressing the Christians? Is it true that God interposed a temporal warlike defence for the preservation of the apostles and primitive Christians? Were not all the apostles, except John, put to death by their Jewish and heathen persecutors? Did not myriads of martyrs bleed, and burn, and otherwise suffer death through a succession of grievous persecutions? What was done to destroy their enemies for their defence? Were they not left to work their way through much tribulation, in faith, patience, meekness and love? So the record obviously represents. But granting that God destroyed the Jews on account of their oppressing the Christians, it was no case of self-defence, any more than it would have been if he had destroyed them for crucifying Jesus, or stoning Stephen. And how did God destroy the Jews? By means of war waged by the Romans against them. Was this war a defensive war on the part of the Romans? Just as much and no more than our Revolutionary war was on the part of Great Britain. It was an *offensive* war. And God ordered it, did he? And Christ could not have reflected the character of the Father, unless he sanctioned that offensive war, because he pointed forward to it as an encouragement to his afflicted followers! Then God and Christ were both for *offensive* war, at least in some cases! Why, then, should the objector be so care-

Digitized by Google

ful to plead for defensive wars, and to eschew wars of offence and retaliation? The truth is, such arguments agree neither with facts nor with themselves. They are self-exploded. What proves too much, proves nothing to the purpose. If it is according to the law of Christ to go to war, slaughter and destroy our fellow-creatures in self-defence, it is so to do the same thing in the way of punishing and subduing wicked nations or individuals on account of their sins. And this only shows that the whole plea for purely defensive war and injury is illusive and fallacious. So long as mankind hold to the rightfulness of war and penal injury at all, they will fight, and destroy whenever, in their own judgment, it appears necessary, whether in retaliation, self-defence, prevention, or the protection of a distant oppressed people. Nothing but total abstinence from all war and injurious inflictions will remove the evil.

But, it is said, suppose five hundred citizens of Boston become intoxicated with passion, and, in their madness and revenge, arm themselves with deadly weapons, and commence slaughtering our peaceable citizens, laying waste our dwellings, and reducing our city to ashes,—crying out as they move onward,—Destruction, destruction to the reigning powers! Now would it be wrong to resist, fire upon, and cut down, such a band of outlaws?

Answer. How happens it that such a mob springs up in Boston? Is Boston a Christian city? Is it full of Christian temples, Christian teachers, and Christian professors? Are Christians at the head of its respectability, its moral influence, and its government affairs? Are these Christians true to their principles? Have they neither devised nor consented to uphold any institutions, laws and processes which violate the following great Christian precepts, "All things whatsoever ye would that others should do unto you, do ye even so unto them;" "Let every man seek not his own but another's wealth;" "Be not high-minded, but condescend to men of low estate;" "He that would be great among you shall be servant of all;" "Be not respecters of persons;" "The strong ought to bear the infirmities of the weak, and not to please themselves." "It is more blessed to give than to receive;" "If a man smite thee on the one cheek offer the other;"

Digitized by Google

"Avenge not yourselves, but rather give place unto wrath; if thine enemy hunger, feed him; if he thirst, give him drink; Be not overcome with evil, but overcome evil with good." Is this the burden of the preaching in Boston? Are these precepts practically insisted on in the churches of Boston, among the members in their daily walk and conversation? Do the Christian legislators, judges and magistrates of Boston carry these principles into the government of the city? If all this is matter of fact, the danger of the mob supposed, is extremely small. And should it occur, against a million of improbabilities, I would recommend, as an antidote, not cannon and musket-balls, swords or bayonets, but a deputation of five hundred humble, intelligent, unarmed Christians, fully authorized to redress any real grievances, courageous enough not to be frightened by carnal weapons, and meek enough not to be irritated by threats. The mob will be effectually suppressed without bloodshed. A single woman in Philadelphia, a few years ago, disarmed a mob that came to tear down her husband's dwelling. She spread her tables with fruits and provisions, opened her front door, hoisted her windows, and when the raving mob approached the house, presented herself at the door, and invited them to come in, and be welcome. What could they do in such a case? They were confounded — overcome. They partook of her hospitality, and went off without doing their intended mischief. There are ways enough for Christians to defend themselves without injurious force, when they are Christians indeed.

The difficulty in all these supposed cases is, that nominal Christians identify themselves with worldly-minded and unrighteous men, in a city or nation, consent to their antichristian maxims, habits, governments, laws, usages and customs, concur with, and approve them, in sowing the seeds and nurturing the plants of violence; and then, when the harvest of mischief comes, having compromised away their Christian principles, they can imagine no other means of self-defence than those of pagans and atheists — those of brute force and deadly injury. "If the salt have lost its savor, wherewith shall it be salted?" If men professing to be Christians, will live and act like heathen; if they will mix themselves with the people,

Digitized by Google

so as to lose not only their pure testimony and moral power, but the benefits of their own self-protective principles; if they will unite with proud, selfish and vindictive minds in sowing the east wind, they must reap the whirlwind. But let them not urge these self-procured evils as insuperable difficulties in the way of Christian non-resistance. "What a man sows, that shall he also reap." They that will trust in the sword, must perish with the sword. But if any man, family, community, state or nation, will heartily assent to, and practise in accordance with, the non-injurious peace-promoting precepts of Christ, they will be found not only practicable, but in the highest degree conservative and self-defensive, both with respect to foreign and domestic injurers.

In conclusion, non-resistants are admonished that they begin wrong; that they unchain the tiger, and then seek to tame him; that they ought to begin at the seat of the evil, where the Saviour began. Regenerate men; give them moral power to control their passions; teach them their rights and duties; teach them their relations to each other; show them in what their real interests consist; wake up in their hearts a true love; and then they will be prepared for the promised days of peace. Reply. This is just what we are endeavoring to do; and we complain of fighting men, who profess to teach and show the way of salvation, because we think they are doing exactly the reverse. We see that they have been pursuing nearly their present method of training the church, and regenerating the world, for fifteen hundred years, with very ill success; and therefore we insist on going back to the principles and practice of the primitive Christians, in respect to war and personal injuries. We do not expect to force the principles and practice of Christian non-resistance on people who profess no serious faith in Jesus Christ, or discipleship to him. But we insist that men who call themselves the ministers of Christ, who profess to stand in his testimony, and also church-members who declare that they have experienced regeneration, and are no longer under the dominion of the carnal mind — we insist that all such are bound to exemplify, in some tolerable degree at least, the humility, forgiveness, and charity, so explicitly inculcated in the non-resistance precepts of their acknowledged Lord.

Digitized by Google

If they will only be faithful to their superior light, to their heavenly principles, the rest of the world will be brought right in due time. But if they will not be *practical* Christians; if they will not even acknowledge these plain duties of the gospel; if they employ their utmost ingenuity to justify self-defensive violence; when will the world be converted? when will the promised days of peace come? If professing Christians are determined to fight and resist with injurious force, so long as any body is wicked enough to commit aggression and assault, when are men to be redeemed from this wickedness? Will not those who are wicked enough to aggress, continue thus just as long as good men are bad enough to resist them with injury? And if so, can we ever have peace? What is Christianity worth more than Mahometanism, if it be a fighting religion? What is regeneration worth more than unregeneration, if it still leave men willing to kill and injure under the plea of self-defence? I behold a minister of Christ blessing a military parade! I see a Christian with his bayonet run through another Christian on the field of battle! I behold one professedly full of the love of God and man, sitting in the chair of government, taking the lives, or inflicting irreparable injury on the persons of his fellow-sinners in the name of justice! Is this true Christianity? the Christianity of Jesus and his early followers? Is this the way in which the world is to be regenerated? I have not so learned Christ. Let the loving, the humble, and the candid ponder these things; and let them that name the name of Christ depart from iniquity. A. B.

Note by the Editor. We insert the foregoing article, as one of the ablest defences of "Non-resistance," which we have seen brought into so narrow a space. But, though it presents many very important considerations, urged with great force, we confess it does not so far convince us, as to bring us to its extreme conclusions. We have doubts concerning some of its premises, — its interpretation of the precepts quoted from the New Testament, and its statements of the case of the primitive Christians. Nor do we see the essential difference, in principle, between injuring an assailant's mental sensitiveness, and injuring his mere physical sensitiveness, — between restraining him, against his will, by what is called harmless force, and restraining him, though but equally against his will, by what is called injurious force. Both

Digitized by Google

kinds of violence disappoint, pain, and often mortify, or even degrade him, in his own estimation; and both kinds may, therefore, in almost every case, be carried too far; but we do not understand why one should be fully allowed, and the other wholly prohibited.

Art. XVI.

Divine Love.

"Behold what manner of love the Father hath bestowed upon us, that we should be called the sons of God."—1 John iii. 1.

Of all the momentous subjects to which divine revelation invites the profound and reverential meditations of the theologian, it is believed that none can be justly estimated to be greater than the one presented in the passage which heads this article. Dr. A. Clarke makes the following very just remarks on it: "Whole volumes might be written on this and the two following verses, without exhausting the extraordinary subject contained in them, namely, the love of God to man. The apostle himself, though evidently filled with God, and walking in the fulness of his light, does not attempt to describe it; he calls on the world and the church to behold it; to look upon it, to contemplate it, and wonder at it. 'What manner of love,' . . what great love, both as to quantity and quality; for these ideas are included in the original term. The length, the breadth, the depth, the height, he does not attempt to describe." In view of these appropriate remarks, we feel admonished that little can be offered, in the narrow space of a few pages, towards doing justice to a subject which is truly boundless. But remembering that the two mites cast into the treasury were an acceptable offering, being all which the giver possessed, we feel encouraged to offer the little which our ability will allow.

> "Of God above or man below,
> What can we reason but from what we know?"

Bounded within such a narrow sphere of knowledge, our reasoning must correspond with our limits, and not be allowed to wander into the fields of speculation with no

Digitized by Google

other guide than wild imagination. We may begin with ourselves. We know that we exist; and we know some things in regard to our physical, intellectual, and moral organization. By this knowledge, we are authorized to infer, that we had no agency in creating ourselves, as we were put in possession of our being, pursuant to a purpose, wisdom, and power not our own. Hence, by fair induction, we may safely argue, that if we find that our existence, embracing all the parts which, in their relations and combinations, constitute us what we are, is a blessing, and not a curse, a good, and not an evil, this blessing, this good, must be attributed to the purpose, wisdom, and power of God, our Creator. Now, by this process of reasoning, which does not seem at all to embarrass our limited intellects, we arrive at a clear conviction of the fact, that the love of our heavenly Father is an uncaused, abiding principle, an attribute of his nature; and this fact is the same which is asserted by the author of our text, where he says, "God is love."

One important question which relates to our subject, is, Why does God love mankind? The fact that our heavenly Father does love us, is granted, it being the most important part of our subject; but the reason why he loves us, is a question, the investigation of which will lead to the detection and correction of any erroneous views which have been entertained on the subject, providing we arrive at a right conclusion. It is somewhat difficult to account for some opinions; especially on account of their conflicting with each other, though they are entertained by the same persons. It is the general practice of religious teachers to hold up to the people, that our obedience to the divine requirements, is the cause why our heavenly Father loves us. If they do not state this opinion in the words in which we here express it, the idea is zealously enforced, that if we piously and faithfully obey God's commandments, God will love us, and be gracious unto us, and will bestow upon us all needed blessings, not only in this our mortal state, but hereafter and forever. On the contrary, the idea, that our heavenly Father will neither love us, nor show us any favor, if we are disobedient, is still more zealously enforced on the minds of the people. Now, when we carefully examine this commonly taught and

Digitized by Google

generally received opinion, we see that it makes our obedience of God's commandments a condition on which depends God's love to us. Here we would caution the reader not so to misunderstand us, as to suppose we attach no importance to the keeping of the divine requirements. Obedience to the commandments of God never was, by any one, nor can it ever be, estimated above its value; nor can its importance be represented greater than it is, or insisted on beyond its claims. But if we make our obedience a condition of God's love to us, we thereby relinquish that important position at which we arrived in our reasoning above, namely, that the love of our heavenly Father is an uncaused, abiding principle of his nature. And not only do we fall into this most manifest error by making our obedience a condition of God's love to us, but we commit another, as great, by making our obedience the cause of that of which it is, in fact, a consequence; for nothing is more manifestly true, than that our obedience to the divine requirements is a consequence of the manifestation of our heavenly Father's love to us. With as much propriety might we believe, that the sun shines on the flowers of our gardens, and that the rains descend upon them, and that the dews collect on them, because the buds from which they came have unfolded themselves, and because their petals so beautifully display their variegated hues. Dr. A. Clarke, the Methodist commentator, says, in reference to the text which heads this article, "For we had neither claim nor merit, that we should be called, that is, constituted or made, the sons of God, who were, before, the children of the wicked one; criminal, earthly, devilish; therefore, the love which brought us from such a depth of misery and degradation must appear the more extraordinary and impressive."

Another important error, which religious teachers have generally held forth to the people, and which has been almost universally believed, is, that what the Scriptures teach concerning the new birth, is a condition of our heavenly Father's love to us. Scarcely has any point of doctrine been more earnestly contended for than this, or exerted a more powerful influence on the minds of the people. The deep anxiety, the bewildering perplexity, the awful apprehensions, which have even distracted thousands, who feared

Digitized by Google

they might go out of the world without this indispensable preparation, are truly inexpressible. While many have been thus affected by this error, others have quieted their minds by attending to a few of the commandments of man, believing that by so doing they might obtain this new birth, and have so far succeeded as to hope they had obtained the prize. But a greater number, no doubt, have been differently affected; and viewing the whole subject with a bewildering horror, have driven it from their thoughts, and engrossed their minds in the cares and pleasures of the world. Here, again, we caution the reader against the supposition that we do not believe what the Scriptures teach respecting the new birth, or that we do not believe in its necessity and importance. The error lies, in this case as in the former, in making *that* a condition of our heavenly Father's love to us, which is a consequence of a manifestation of his love to our understanding. The Saviour told Nicodemus, to whom he spake of being born again, "That which is born of the flesh is flesh; and that which is born of the spirit is spirit." The evangelist John, speaking of those to whom power had been given to become the sons of God, says, "Which were born, not of blood, nor of the will of the flesh, nor of the will of man, but of God." And the apostle Paul, on the same subject, says, "But God, who is rich in mercy, for his great love wherewith he loved us, even when we were dead in sins, hath quickened us together with Christ." Why should any enlightened Christian either believe or teach, that the new birth, which is the work of the divine Spirit, and pursuant to that great love wherewith he loved us, even when we were dead in sins, is a condition of God's love to us?

Another opinion, equally erroneous as those we have examined, and which has as generally been received, relates to what is called the atonement. This atonement has been considered the cause or condition of our heavenly Father's love to the human race. This error, equally with the two former, denies our conclusion, namely, that the love of God, which flows in such a wonderful manner to the human family, is an uncaused, abiding principle or attribute of his nature. And, moreover, like the two former errors, it supposes *that* to be a condition of God's love to mankind, which is the product or consequence of that love.

Digitized by Google

The testimony of Jesus presents this subject in its true light. He says, John iii. 16: "For God so loved the world, that he gave his only begotten Son, that whosoever believeth in him should not perish, but have everlasting life." With this agrees the following: 1 John iv. 9, 10, "In this was manifested the love of God toward us, because that God sent his only begotten Son into the world, that we might live through him. Herein is love, not that we loved God, but that he loved us, and sent his Son to be the propitiation for our sins." Again, the same divine truth is recorded, Romans v. 8: "But God commendeth his love toward us, in that, while we were yet sinners, Christ died for us." The Scriptures, above quoted, plainly show that what the Saviour has done for mankind, in room of being the cause of our heavenly Father's love toward us, is the effect of that love, and of its commendation to us. With as much propriety might a numerous family, the children of a wealthy parent, being in possession of many rich presents, which their father had freely bestowed on them, as tokens and memorials of his love, believe and say that their possessing them was the cause or condition of their father's loving them, as Christians can believe and say, that the mediation of Christ, or the new birth, or our obedience to the divine commands, is the cause of our heavenly Father's love toward us. Our new birth, or being born of the Spirit, and our obedience to the divine law, constitute the great, the glorious object, for the accomplishment of which the mission of Christ and the ministration of the gospel were designed; and, therefore, their importance, as we have before said, has never been, nor can be too highly estimated; but when they are so perverted as to be made the cause or condition of our heavenly Father's love to mankind, their glory is changed, their beauty gone, their sweetness turned to acid; and in room of rendering to God the glory which is his due, they rob him of that manner of love which he freely bestowed on us that we might be called his sons.

If we would but carefully look into the nature and fitness of the divine law and its requirements, in room of finding that our obedience to them is a condition of God's love to us, we should find that they are, in fact, a bestowment of his love, and a full proof of the same. What is

Digitized by Google

the nature of this law? It is love. What is the amount of all its requirements? It is love. This law flows to us as a pure stream from the fountain of divine love. The following description of the law of the Lord, found in the XIXth Psalm, shows this subject in its true light: "The law of the Lord is perfect, converting the soul; the testimony of the Lord is sure, making wise the simple. The statutes of the Lord are right, rejoicing the heart; the commandment of the Lord is pure, enlightening the eyes. The fear of the Lord is clean, enduring forever; the judgments of the Lord are true and righteous altogether. More to be desired are they than gold, yea, than much fine gold; sweeter also than honey and the honeycomb. Moreover by them is thy servant warned; and in keeping of them is great reward." In room of our good works being a condition of the divine love toward us, they are the productions of divine grace, as we find expressed by St. Paul, Ephesians ii. 8–10: "For by grace are ye saved through faith; and that not of yourselves; it is the gift of God; not of works, lest any man should boast. For we are his workmanship, created in Christ Jesus unto good works, which God hath before ordained, that we should walk in them." Should any one object to these arguments, and say that they set aside our free moral agency, the objector is reminded of the fact, that whatever of free agency we possess, it must be the free gift of God, and whatever benefit we derive from it, is a just cause of our gratitude to the Giver of every good and perfect gift.

In addition to what has been said concerning the manner of that love which the Father hath bestowed upon us, that we might be called the sons of God, we may proceed to consider this love in regard to its agreement with the divine wisdom and power. The wisdom and power of our Creator, are manifested in the constitution, government, and harmony of all creation, so far as we are able to comprehend. And such are our capacities, though limited comparatively speaking to narrow bounds, that we are able to trace evident marks of wisdom and power divine, in the arrangement and government of various planets, which, in their wondrous courses round the sun, and their diurnal motions, maintain their relation to their great common centre, and to each other. And the wisdom,

Digitized by Google

and power, thus evidently manifested, we are convinced, are as extensive as boundless space. If we turn to the contemplation of our earth, its seas, its continents, its mountains, its rivers, its fossils; together with all the elements of which our bodies are composed; and if we consider how they are all governed by, and according to, that wisdom and power which constituted their order and harmony; and if we also notice their perfect adaptation to answer the divine purpose,—we discover as evident marks of the wisdom and power of God in these, as in those vast worlds which the science of astronomy presents to our wondering eyes. Farthermore, if we minutely inspect the wonderful organization of our physical bodies, and that of animals, and even insects, we discover equal manifestations of the same wisdom and power. Such contemplations lead our minds to a conviction that the wisdom and power of God are infinite; and we exclaim, in the language of an inspired writer, "O Lord, how manifold are thy works! in wisdom hast thou made them all." Now, the object we have in view, in calling the attention of the reader to the consideration of the boundless extent of the wisdom and power of God, is to show thereby that the divine love must also be unlimited. It is seen at once, that we must come to this conclusion, or allow that the divine wisdom and power extend beyond the reach of the love and goodness of our heavenly Father; than which, no opinion could be more dishonorable to God, or more appalling to our minds. This would make the love and goodness of God finite and limited, while his wisdom remains infinite and unlimited, and his power likewise. Who could endure the thought, that unlimited wisdom and power are at work, where love and goodness are not! But should this idea be admitted, another, more horrible if possible, rushes on the mind; which, looking back into all past eternity, sees this same unbounded wisdom and this unlimited power at work where not one ray of love can reach the dismal gloom; and to complete the horror-inspiring scene, all future eternity wears the same aspect! But we feel confident, that no reasonable person will allow that such ideas can be true; but that all will come to this joy-inspiring conclusion, that the love and goodness of God are as extensive as his wisdom and

Digitized by Google

power; and exclaim with the apostle, "Behold what manner of love the Father hath bestowed upon us, that we should be called the sons of God!" Not only the infinity of the divine love, in regard to extent, claims our consideration, but its infinity also in regard to duration; it being the same yesterday, to-day, and forever. Divine love combined with the wisdom and power of the Creator in the work of creation, and to the full extent of their operations, impressed its image on their productions. Nowhere can we discern the indications of wisdom and power, in the works of God, where the manifestations of divine love are not equally apparent. Could an anatomist fully explore the whole and every part of an animal body, so as clearly to discern the design of the Creator's wisdom in the relation of all its parts to the whole, he would, without doubt, see the adaptation of all those parts to the benefit of the creature examined, and be convinced that the wisdom which contrived the wonderful system, is the wisdom of love and goodness.

The foregoing arguments may suffice to put our minds on the right track, and to direct our contemplations to the wonderful displays of divine love in the economy of universal providence, and in the gospel of our Redeemer. When the people of Lystra would have offered sacrifices to Paul and Barnabas, as unto gods, because of the cure of the impotent man, the apostles dissuaded them in the following words: "Sirs, why do ye these things? we also are men of like passions with you, and preach unto you, that ye should turn from these vanities unto the living God, which made heaven, and earth, and the sea, and all things that are therein; who in times past suffered all nations to walk in their own ways. Nevertheless, he left not himself without witness, in that he did good, and gave us rain from heaven, and fruitful seasons, filling our hearts with food and gladness." We see here, that God bears witness of himself, by doing good to his creatures, in sending us rains from heaven, and fruitful seasons, whereby he fills our hearts with food and gladness. If the witness which our heavenly Father bears of himself in doing us good, is allowed to be a true witness, it follows that he is, in fact, good to all, to whom he does good. Wicked, designing men sometimes bestow good things

Digitized by Google

on those on whom they mean to practise deception, and towards whom they bear no good will; but it would be impious in the extreme to accuse God of doing thus. We are the more careful on this point, because there are many religious teachers, who allow, that God is good to all men in dispensing to them temporal blessings; but who will not allow us to attach so much importance to these impartial manifestations of divine goodness, as to be led thereby to rest assured that our spiritual interests are safe in the hands of this Giver of every good gift, for time and eternity. They seem to be unmindful of the teachings of Jesus, which were designed to enforce one of the richest of his precepts on the minds of those whom he taught, where he says, "But I say unto you, love your enemies, bless them that curse you, do good to them that hate you, and pray for them which despitefully use you and persecute you; that ye may be the children of your Father which is in heaven; for he maketh his sun to rise on the evil and on the good, and sendeth rain on the just and on the unjust." Here the divine Teacher evidently makes use of the sunshine and the rain, as evidences of that impartial love of God, which his precept requires of his disciples. It seems that the teachers, of whom we speak, are afraid that their hearers should have too much confidence in the love and goodness of God, apprehending that they may thereby be led to neglect the use of those means, by which they may secure that love to themselves; not considering the divine declaration, that "we love him because he first loved us."

With the weight of all these evidences of the love of our heavenly Father on our minds, let us now, for a moment, direct our eyes to Calvary, and behold what manner of love was there displayed. Did Jesus die for a few chosen friends, who had, by their good works, secured his favor? He "gave himself a ransom for all, to be testified in due time." For his murderers he prayed, "Father, forgive them, for they know not what they do." As we have before quoted, "God commendeth his love toward us, in that while we were yet sinners, Christ died for us." Here we behold what manner of love the Father hath bestowed upon us, that we might be called the sons of God. This is that manner of love which, in Christ, is

Digitized by Google

set before us for an example. If we possess this love in our hearts, and if we practise it in our lives, we are his disciples. He says, "By this shall all men know that ye are my disciples, if ye have love one to another."

When we read the history of the Christian church, through many ages past, how rarely do we find the traces of this manner of love! "Like angels' visits, few, and far between," does this divine glory appear. Much oftener do we see Christian against Christian, armed with fire and sword. Much more frequently do we meet with stakes and fagots. Such sights are sickening to the heart. But the day of antichrist, we hope, is wearing away, and its darkness receding before the prevailing light of divine love. Let every Christian, of every sort and denomination, steadily behold this manner of love; drink deeply of its waters; and walk in its light. Then will Zion appear in her garments of beauty, and the whole earth be filled with the glory of God. H. B.

Art. XVII.

The Attractions of the Cross.

The Attractions of the Cross; designed to illustrate the leading Truths, Obligations, and Hopes of Christianity. By Gardiner Spring, D. D., New York: M. W. Dodd. 1846.

To the Jew, the cross was a stumbling-block, and to the Greek it was foolishness; but unto those who comprehended its divine meaning, it was the power and wisdom of God. To these alone did it have attraction. To these it was the symbol of the highest moral glory; and whether they were of the Jews, the Greeks, or the Barbarians, they found alike that it was made to them, of God, wisdom and righteousness, sanctification and redemption. It fed their holiest aspirations by the sublime thoughts it suggested; it purified their affections by the beauties of holiness; and it gave to their lives the wisdom and power of love.

These different views of the cross manifestly prove that the power of the cross lies in the conceptions we form of

Digitized by Google

the death of Christ. "As a man thinketh in his heart, so is he." His cherished thoughts color his impressions. He sees only as he thinks. The crystalized vapor floating in the atmosphere is a wandering star, if so he imagines; and the comet is a new-formed agent of destruction, if so his thought will have it. And so, in reversing the supposition, and viewing the reality. This law of mind is not to be reversed by religion nor theology. It operates in those departments of thought, as well as in the ordinary matters of conversation; and no less in reference to the cross, than in respect to any other subject of meditation, "as a man thinketh in his heart, so is he."

This idea has an important bearing in reference to the preaching of Christ crucified — a great theme of apostolic preaching. We hear much, and we should hear much, of the attractions of the cross. The New Testament gives them a prominent place. We recognize their presence every where, like the diffusive charms of a character in a high-wrought drama, who, though not always seen, is never forgotten. The heart is softened by the pathos, and strengthened by the energy, with which they are treated of. The attractions of the cross, like the attractions of the stars, the flowers, the sea, and the whole round of nature's beauties and harmonies, will never fade nor die. There they are, like the bow in the cloud, whose hues are the same now as in our childhood; the same as when the first eye gazed upon them; and there they will be forever. Science and philosophy will move on, and their advance will give new aspects to each and all. The wondrous wisdom of the Creator will be more unfolded. Mind shall ever find an inexhaustible study in their make and relations; and, like the rays of the distant stars that are now travelling down to our earth to cheer some mariner on the broad ocean in other years, so are new thoughts or ideas evolving from the study of the cross, that shall be needed to encourage some bold adventurer on the sea of truth and love.

The attractions themselves of the cross, and the mind's reception and entertainment of them, are separate matters. Their capacity to impress, and the degree with which they impress us, are as separate as the sermon on the Mount and the hearts that heard it: — to some, it came with a

Digitized by Google

re-creating power on their characters, so that they became as a house built upon a rock; but to others it died away, and they were still but as the dwelling built upon the sand of the sea-shore.

Here, then, is Christ crucified; in the record of the event, in the teachings of the symbol, and in the grand results on character, Christ is preached. But how look we on all these? Is the telescope right, or reversed? That is the question. Was the event not a result of the malice of the Jews, but a voluntary offering of Jesus to take upon himself, as a vicarious sacrifice, the wrath of a God who would remove punishment, or sin, from humanity, only by the substitution of an innocent being on "the central gallows of the universe?" If so, then the attraction of the cross centres in the self-sacrifice of Christ, but rises no higher, to any amiable view of the Father. The fatherly character of God is denied; and, as Paradise to Mahomet was "under the shadow of swords," so to us it is under — it cannot be above — the shadow of the sword that swung from the hand of vindictive justice above the cross of Jesus. If there was a necessity for such a substitution, it is glorious to see the offer of Jesus; but all the attraction which this idea gives to him, it takes from the Deity. It is a crown which only one can wear. It is like those few examples of moral heroism — the oases of history — where the sacrifice of courtly glory, and princely ease, and lofty station, has been made for the cause of common liberty; such as the yielding of a throne near the Pharaoh, to work out deliverance from his severity, for the brethren loved with a true Hebrew's love. "By faith Moses, when he was come to years, refused to be called the son of Pharaoh's daughter; choosing rather to suffer affliction with the people of God, than to enjoy the pleasures of sin for a season; esteeming the reproach of Christ greater riches than the treasures in Egypt; for he had respect unto the recompense of the reward." The "reproach of Christ," then, was endured before, by Moses; and what was the reproach, but the reproach of serving God, in promoting the good of humanity, allying himself with the lowly and oppressed, and throwing, at one cast, his all for their liberty? "And the Lord said unto Moses, See, I have made thee a god to Pharaoh." We see a like purpose in the ordinance fulfilled

Digitized by Google

in the gift of Jesus Christ, the crucified. We cannot take the opposite view, for it utterly distorts the intent of the record. It makes a human sacrifice acceptable to God, when, as far back as Abraham's time, man was taught that his Maker asked not for such offering. We shrink in horror as we behold the Jewish high-priest declaring it to be needful that one die, and not the whole nation perish, and so delivering up Jesus to the death — innocent though he was; and yet without any horror, the same thing is attributed to a higher than Caiaphas, by the creeds of men. Caiaphas made him the vicar of the nation, thus exalting him to the rank of a martyr. But did we look upon him as voluntarily standing in that lot, it would give no beauty to the idea of the necessity for such a procedure. Caiaphas put forth a superstition to cover up the deformity of his deed; it is but the flimsiest gauze upon the ebony statue. The darkness is not hidden, and a breath reveals it all. How attraction can be given to the popular view of the death of Christ, while it is utterly withheld from the high-priest's position, is not for us to explain.

This is not a mere theological question. It is of the highest and gravest practical character. We want the true spirit of the cross in our midst. Human suffering requires it. The earth groans for want of it. Over-worked, hard-pressed, ignorant, starving, and debased humanity, imperatively demands it. How little are the attractions of the cross really felt! How few of the affections, the energetic and operative affections, are drawn forth by it! The cross is regarded rather in a spirit that loves the pathetic, that delights to weep, to be melted by the anguish of distressed humanity, than as God would have it regarded. People love it as they love some funeral prayers — because they make them weep, and to them there is a luxury in such wo. They have not yet learned that the cross should be like true prayer, that quiets and soothes, so that the energies of the soul are collected, their might increased, as when Jesus came down from the mount of midnight prayer, and walked majestic upon the tempestuous waves of the sea. We should go to the cross to be strengthened, to become more resolute and determined in our pursuit of spiritual good. We should go there to see what sin has done, and what love can do; to learn the lessons that give the highest

Digitized by Google

moral significance to life, and to sound the depths of our being, that we may know the attraction of the cross, both as inviting our admiration, and exerting a motive force to draw us to holiness and love. And such will be the influence of the cross to those who visit it aright.

But some fear that our views will weaken the influence of the cross. Let them be answered by a similitude: In an antique palace was discovered an ancient painting. It had attractions from many causes, besides the execution of the picture itself; but on cleaning it, here and there were discovered glimpses of another work beneath the outward painting. Fear paused, lest the operation might spoil the outward, and the other not reward the toil and make good the loss. But the glimpses of the covered picture became more powerful than the whole of the other, and the work of unshrouding went on; when lo! a beautiful head of Christ was exposed to view. Eyes gazed till they wept, and the attractions of the first and modern painting were forgotten in the superior and transcendent attractions of the other. Thus the true glory of the cross has been hidden, and men are as fearful to remove the veils, lest they should lessen the power of the cross. But if they will patiently gaze, they shall see, at least, glimpses of hidden glory, that will prophesy bright results. Let them heed the prophesies, and labor; and their reward shall be great in the superior attractions that shall surround the sacrifice of Christ.

There is one striking difference between the popular view of the attractions of the cross, and our view of them. On this I design to dwell, as a theme of the highest and most direct practical character, though involving many points of theology. The popular view appeals to the love of outward glory — the pride which makes it difficult to be humble and yield a high station; but the other appeals to the human affections, with their infinite wealth of deep and strong sympathies.

This view of the subject has been suggested by the perusal of the work at the head of this article. The *name* of that volume was peculiarly pleasant. We took it up and opened it with eagerness. But names are not always things; and the work gave us no new insight into the glory of the cross. We love the work that speaks to us

Digitized by Google

of Christ in such a manner as some books of travel describe the attractions of scenes and places, so as to carry us there in imagination. I once read some graphic sketches of Jerusalem and its environs, that were so impressive, that every night, for a week at least, I was there, familiar with every spot, and at home with all I met. And such impressive power I hoped to meet in Dr. Spring's volume, but I found it not. I journeyed with it, and it only made the jars and discords of railway travelling more repulsive; and, as I shut my eyes to "make pictures," no sweet and touching visions of love floated before me. I thought upon the views presented by the writer, and I did not wonder that, with such views of the Deity, he should deem any form of the doctrine of the final restoration of all mankind, as "a vain hope, a soul-destroying delusion."[1] That "error," he says, in continuation, "proceeds upon a false estimate of the great work of redemption, and *of the great difficulty of saving men at all.*" And yet he tells us, "the divine purposes are all accomplished." At "the last day," history will be but "the record of *executed* purposes of God."[2] He boldly takes the position that the "actual purpose of the cross was *not* to save all;" and that those who are saved, cannot attribute their salvation to "any foreseen faith and holiness; for these are His gifts, and the very things which the cross secures."[3] "The purpose is a *restricted* purpose, and limited to Christian lands, and to those in Christian lands who become acquainted with him whom God has sent. There are entire nations whom he has given over to a reprobate mind, and left under the veils of ignorance and error. Men are born in millions during ages of darkness, over which they had no control; and in lands of darkness where their birth and residence are determined by a providence that is above them. They dwell in the darkness and shadow of death; and because they have not the means of salvation, they cannot have its hopes."[4] This is, indeed, to exhibit the sovereignty of God; but what a Sovereign is thus made manifest! The stupendous and utter waste of souls involved in the execution of his purposes, might well make the most trustful stagger in their faith. And yet he speaks of an "all-sufficient redemption," and attempts to give an *aspect* of

[1] p. 71. [2] pp. 77, 78. [3] p. 80. [4] 82.

Digitized by Google

universality to the mediation of Christ. That this aspect of universality can be but the faintest shadow, is evident from his assertion, that the purpose of the cross is limited by the terms of it, to believers only, and consequently to but a small part of mankind. The "millions" born and dying where they have not "the means of salvation," and consequently "cannot have its hopes," are a more fearful monument, to speak of the character of a Sovereign's purposes, than the millioned-scull pillar of barbarian cruelty. And with this awful exhibition of "executed purposes" before him, he attempts to grapple with the grand testimony of the Scriptures as to the extent of redemption. Yet he can do nothing but refer to the Universalist, and thus excite a prejudice against the fulness of the testimony that Jesus died for all — that he tasted death for every man; and hence he says, that when we "read of Christ's taking away the sins of the world, and that he died for all, it must mean *what none but the rashest Universalist believes*, or that his Son was set forth to be such a propitiation as is amply sufficient for the salvation of all mankind, if all should repent and believe."[5] And yet "millions" are born and die where there is no opportunity for evangelical repentance! Dr. Owen is quoted to define this incongruity, and he tells us what was the character of the Will that lies back of all the doings connected with the cross. Hear him: "Sufficient was the sacrifice of Christ for the redemption of the whole world, and for the expiation of all the sins of all and every man in the world. That it should be *applied*, made a price for them, and become beneficial to them according to the worth that is in it, is *external* to it, and doth not arise from it, but merely depends on the intention and will of God."[6] The result, then, is, that "the intention and will of God," whose "purposes are all accomplished," is to give but a small conquest at last to the redemption of Christ, though the worth of the mediation is infinite!

The view of Christ's sufferings offered in these pages, is of the most repulsive character. His sufferings "were penal, because they were inflicted by justice, and imposed as a legal sentence. They were executed in the form of justice; and, though not the penalty of the law incurred,

[5] p. 96. [6] p. 99.

Digitized by Google

were accepted in place of it, as a full equivalent."[7] A reference is made to the Levitical sacrifices, and the assertion is, that "the punishment due to the offender was transferred to the appointed sacrifice; and its great design was a significant prefiguration of that great act of divine justice which imposed upon the Lamb of God sins not his own."[8] This view of the Levitical sacrifices is the great error that beclouds the judgment of Christians, and prevents a true perception of the attractions of the cross. They were acts of worship, and not substitutes for the divine penalties against sin. They are always to be classed with the "spiritual sacrifices" under the new dispensation of truth, and thus are to be regarded as the soul's expression of homage, contrition, and penitence towards God. Acts of worship merely, are not comparable with the value of deeds of rectitude and love, in the New Testament; and as to the Old, have we a necessity for repeating the words of Jesus, "Go and learn what that meaneth, I will have mercy, and not sacrifice."[9] If David had not understood this preference in the Deity, he would not have declared a broken spirit and contriteness of heart *more* acceptable than outward sacrifices.[10] With these plain facts before us, it is the highest presumption to speak of the death of Christ as a vicarious sacrifice, involving the idea that on him was inflicted the punishment due to us all. Only guilt can feel punishment, and only on the guilty can justice even attempt to inflict it. Where no guilt is, the infliction of capital punishment cannot but outrage every sentiment of justice. "Surely God will not do wickedly; neither will the Almighty pervert judgment."

But Dr. Spring, in treating of the attraction of the cross, tells us that "the flames of justice burned against God's well-beloved Son."[11] "We fix our eyes on the cross, and feel that it is a fearful thing to fall into the hands of the living God."[12] "It was not the death of one that he was about to endure, but the concentrated wrath of God which his violated law denounced on *millions*."[13] Martyrs always suffer from the cruelty of some power; and with his views of the death of Christ, Dr. Spring may well say, "The testimony of Christ is the testimony of the Prince of mar-

[7] p. 50. [8] pp. 51, 52. [9] Matt. ix. 13. [10] Ps. li. 16, 17. [11] p. 38. [12] p. 35. [13] p. 10.

Digitized by Google

tyrs." But to him the wrath which Christ suffered was not the wrath of man. Most singularly, in this connection, is the absurdity of the doctrine of the Trinity brought into view. The scene in Gethsemane is alluded to, when Jesus "began to be sore amazed and very heavy," and as he was about to endure "the concentrated wrath of God," we are told, "it is no marvel that he was afraid."[14] But in reference to the same scene, as though some might marvel if no other reason than the coming "concentrated wrath of God" was given for his fear, it is said, "His fear was probably excited, not only by the invading sufferings, but by the apprehension that he might not have strength for the unequalled trial. In this fear, he was relieved by a special messenger from heaven. And there appeared an angel from heaven *strengthening* him." And, without hesitation, it is added, "Wonderful proof of his humiliation and suffering, that, at such an hour, a creature should appear to minister to his Creator!" The fear, the weakness, and the dependence of the Creator, here involved, are too repugnant to reason and Scripture to be contemplated with any thing but pity for the believers in such creeds. With such a faith, who can find attractions where the Creator dies! And yet the cross is intended to "impress upon our hearts a sense of his boundless love and mercy!"[15]

The cross was indeed intended to impress us with a sense of the boundless love and mercy of God, but this impression can be made only by a far different view of the cross than such a picture as makes Calvary more terrible than the mount that "burned with fire," where were "blackness, darkness, and tempest." "A right conception of what is included in the cross, insures," says Dr. Spring, "a right conception of every important doctrine contained in the Bible."[16] We accept the proposition, and in view of it repeat the apostolic declaration, that by *the grace of God* Jesus tasted death for every man.[17] *This* is the "right conception" of the cross. How different is it from the view contemplated! It is the very antipodes of the popular doctrine; for that assures us that Jesus suffered the "concentrated wrath of God!" The Scriptures would

[14] p. 10. There is no record that speaks of Jesus being *afraid.*
[15] p. 35. [16] p. 34. [17] Heb. ii. 9.

Digitized by Google

impress us with the wondrous grace of God as exhibited in the cross, for "God commendeth his *love* toward us, in that while we were yet sinners, Christ died for us." "God was *in* Christ, reconciling the world unto himself;" and hence the ministry of Christ is the ministry of reconciliation. On the clouds that hung around the cross, the rainbow shines. Far above all the clouds that men beheld, reigned the Sun of infinite love — the Father to whom the dying prayer of Jesus was addressed, and into whose hands, in the last pang of mortality, he commended his spirit.

We have one more extract to make from the work before us, and this will present the point of contrast to which we referred, in speaking of the appeal which the popular view of the cross makes to the love of outward glory, rather than to human affection. The prophet said of the Messiah, that he should see of the travail of his soul and be satisfied,[18] and we delight to unite this with the philanthropy of Jesus, and find much joy in meditating upon the glorious extent of that redemption which shall satisfy Christ. Dr. Spring tells us, "It was indeed a mighty movement in heaven to show mercy to a part of our guilty and wretched race. God has not told us how many there are, but he has told us that they are numerous enough to give to the Saviour of the world the most exulting triumph over his indignant adversary, and to satisfy him for all his humiliation and shame, and agonies of his incarnation and death."[19]

Here, at first sight, but "a part" of the human race are interested in "the mighty movements in heaven" in behalf of the guilty and wretched. This makes the scheme of redemption wanting in that moral grandeur, which the element of universality alone can give to any project. It has no affinity with the sublime beauty of the prospect which spreads out before us, as we meditate on the assurance of Jesus, "And I, if I be lifted up from the earth, will draw all men unto me."[20]

It is also implied, that the redemption of but a part of our revolted race will be enough to satisfy Christ! But here let us pause with profound thought, for here we may detect why it is that the attraction of the cross is so viewed

[18] Is. liii. 11. [19] pp. 79, 80. [20] John xii. 32.

Digitized by Google

as never to appeal to the love which the precepts of Jesus require — true philanthropy. "The mighty movement in heaven to show mercy to a part of our guilty and wretched race," proposes a sufficient, though limited result, to satisfy — *what?* Not the Christ that was crucified; not that meek and gentle being who felt a sympathy for all the woes of humanity; not him whose miracles were wonders of compassion, and whose love in death accorded well with his life of benevolence. No; it is a Christ who is supposed to be the Deity, veiling himself in flesh, and dwelling on earth as though encompassed with our wants and infirmities, and receiving, at last, after reassuming the Godhead, a part of our race as a satisfaction for his humiliation and shame, his agonies in his incarnation and death. Not a word said about love! Not a syllable of compassion! Not a hint of satisfaction to sympathies that yearned for mankind! *Here* is the secret laid open. It is the humiliation and shame and pain, that engrossed the thoughts; it is to these that the imagination is directed; and theology asks for a reward for these — something that shall satisfy the spirit that thus humbled itself, and "endured the cross." I bless God that in the record where the enduring of the cross is spoken of, it is also written, that he "*despised* the shame." [21] I read there the grand lesson of the Master's life. He despised the shame which was attached to any duty, to any sacrifice required by principle. He that *despises* the shame connected with some deed of moral heroism, does not ask a selfish reward for so doing. No; in the loftiness of spirit, in the sublime aspiration which kindles the enthusiasm that braves all dangers and hardships, there abides a great and grand reward.

When Washington accepted the command of the forces of the United Colonies, he did it in the face of the laugh of all Europe. But he proved the nobleness of his soul, by despising the shame — by giving no heed to it — by being absorbed in the greatness of the work before him. We do not crown him with the fadeless laurel because of his despising the shame, but because of the nobleness of soul that made him despise it. And so with Jesus. It is his love — his boundless, deep, undying love, that wakens our

[21] Heb. xii. 2.

Digitized by Google

admiration. When we read of his being satisfied for the travail of his soul, we do not think merely of his humiliation and shame, but of the love that animated him, and we ask for a result, a consummation, that shall answer that love — that shall fully respond to the forgiveness on the cross, and that throws around it a halo of unapproachable glory when compared with the highest honors of men. It was not because he was humbled — it was not because of the circumstances of shame with which he was surrounded — it was not the agonies of the garden and of Calvary, that alone constituted the labor of Christ's soul. No! There was something that wrestled with all these, and conquered them; something that has made the cross symbolical of whatever is tender and amiable, gentle and forgiving. This constitutes the attraction of the cross! This makes the golden ornament a fit type of unconquerable love. With the eyes fixed upon it, the dying martyr, amid the thousand-tongued fire, can forgive from the heart, and pray for his bitterest enemy, "Lay not this sin to their charge."

This makes the *theology* of the cross a matter of the highest practical importance and utility. It is not a theory meeting and attempting to refute a theory, thought wrestling with thought for mere exercise. No; it takes hold upon this idea, Was Christ's labor of soul a work to subdue a dislike of humiliation — a wrestling, like an exiled king — Napoleon at Helena — with the shame of his condition? or was it an infinitely higher matter? As was the Master, so should the disciple be. We must take up our cross and follow him. Is the shame which sinful man attaches to an unpopular virtue to be wrestled with, or despised? That is the question. Are we to be borne hither and thither by it, or, planting our feet on the rock of principle, "smile at the dagger and defy its point?" As is our choice, so will be the elevation of our character.

I fear that the cross, in another than the ancient sense, has become a stumbling-block. Men are rebuked for their love of the pride of station and circumstance. They are told of the instability of wealth, fame, and power, and they are invoked by all the fires of nobleness that slumber in their veins, to throw from them that regard for outward state — a regard which makes many live for years in a gilded

Digitized by Google

coffin and a jewelled shroud. And then, as though neglectful of the impression desired to be made, the chief delight of the preacher seems to be in picturing the grandeur which Christ gave up in his incarnation; and the aim is to exalt him rather by such descriptions, than by the exhibition of a world-embracing love — a wisdom, a goodness, and an energy, corresponding to the wants of sinful humanity. By his moral greatness he poured contempt upon the pride of kings. It is "the mind that makes the body rich," and Christ the place. For our sakes he did become poor; he companioned with the humble and lowly. They needed his presence and favor. They are the world's hope and strength, but have been trampled upon and despised. He had power to be enthroned in the very palace of wealth, or to be seated on the heights of splendor. The vision in the wilderness, when spirit was conquering flesh, was not all a dream. As we see him seeking the humble home in Capernaum, or bending his way towards Bethany, we do not honor him by imagining that, as he passed by the palaces of opulence in Jerusalem, he had to wrestle with ambition's thoughts. No! The glory of Christ's thoughts surpassed all outward state. He was humbled only in the sight of men, for the Father was with him in his lowliness. He who is a guest with God, need not ask for palace-doors to open, or the freedom of a city.

Here, then, rests the true power of wisdom — the attraction of the cross. It is the love, the melting, subduing, and regenerating love of Jesus. No lightnings of wrath flash from Calvary. The bleeding brow of the Anointed wears no thorns which vindictive cruelty from on high placed there. The javelin that pierced his side, and reached to his heart, was not darted from the heavens. No; by the grace of God — in the execution of the purposes of infinite compassion, and in unity of spirit with the Father's love, — he tasted death for every man; and as there we look, on that death, we see how love for man, God-inspired love, can subdue all that would answer evil by evil, and how God speaks through his Son to correct all misconceptions of his character. "He that spared not his own Son, but freely gave him up for us all," will, with him, give us all things necessary to spiritual

Digitized by Google

growth and happiness. There shine the attractions of the cross. They find their centre in the freeness of God's love; and, radiating from that point, go all the rays of spiritual light and beauty. The sin of man fastened the Saviour to the accursed tree; sin blinded the eye to his loveliness; sin made the Jews reveal in their own characters the moral hideousness that was abhorrent, as they read of it in the olden prophecies; sin chose the nails, and drove them through the hands and feet of Mary's Son! There we see what sin can do — how it can make us war against our highest good, and crucify our best friend! And there, in the love that was true to its purpose, notwithstanding all this sin, we see the glory of divine goodness — a goodness that was pictured in the parable of the prodigal and his father — a goodness that was "kind to the unthankful and evil." The more this love shines out, the more awful appears the sin of those who crucified the Prince of life, and the more we are drawn to the Saviour by the most powerful attraction. There is no attraction like love, standing up amid the wreck of its holiest hopes, and the scattered sanctities of home, baffled on every side, scorned and trampled upon, disregarded by a corruption that seems steeled against the commonest feelings; and, notwithstanding all, faithful to the mission of goodness! It may die of a broken heart; but out of that broken heart shall steal a sweetness that shall never die. The history of such an one attracts the admiration of the world, and the homage of the heart's tears is freely paid to it. All this is seen in the cross of Christ; and thus viewed, it can never be a stumbling-block, much less can it be foolishness. Sometimes, indeed, the clinging of a human heart to the object of its affection, despite the outrages which a moral madness has wrought, is deemed foolishness, but only on earth — never in heaven. How long have the spirits that do our Father's bidding, watched around us,

"And all for love, and nothing for reward."

How faithful is the love of our Maker and Redeemer, that gives us the promise of fulfilling the grand plan of the redemption, and utters in the gospel the song of good will that commenced in heaven. That mighty movement was mightier than many have dreamed. It proposed to

Digitized by Google

show mercy to our guilty and wretched race, without the exception of a single soul. That is the glorious light that shone in the face of Jesus Christ, and that gives to the cross an unutterable attraction.

The attraction of the cross is to be felt rather than described. Take the records and read, without any regard to the subtle metaphysics of the schools, and there will come to the soul a holy reverence for the adherence to principle, the meek forbearance, and the heavenly forgiveness, manifested in the last hours of the Son of God. We take the incidents of the crucifixion too much in fragments, and do not group them together. But only thus can we see the attraction of the cross. The poet heard the sparrow's notes, and, filled with delight as he drank in the melody, he thought he would ever have the sweetness of that songster near him; he caught the bird and bore it home; but the song pleased not there as when heard where God had placed the sparrow, because he "brought not home the river and the sky." Atheism once exulted at finding a bird with what seemed a malformed bill, an essential evil; but when the bird was traced to its own woods, where the dark pines lifted their tall spires to heaven, there, in merriest mood, was the cross-bill employed to lift as a lever the scales of the pine-cone, and to draw into the mouth the welcome seeds. So when the exclamation of Jesus on the cross, in which the anguish of his soul found expression, has been taken from its relations by a violation of truth, it is made by some to signify that God then poured the "seven vials" of wrath at once upon his devoted head; and by others it is so interpreted as to derogate from the perfect trust of Jesus. But viewed in the proper light, it serves to shed a glory on the death of Christ. It proves the frankness of the Saviour. He was always sincere; and this exclamation thus proves that not with stoical hardness was he enduring the agonies of the time, but with all the sensibilities that made him weep at the grave in Bethany. He refused to drink the stupifying draught, because he would be the possessor of his full reason to "*endure* the cross." Group together what he bore and suffered; the outward pains, and the intensity of thought, his fidelity of love to his mother, his disciple, and his enemies, and then marvel, if you can, that for

Digitized by Google

one moment an overpowering agony should come. He expressed that agony, but he immediately seems to have referred it to bodily weakness, and exclaimed, "I thirst!" Then, in the momentary relief which follows the fierce throes of a violent paroxysm, he uttered, "It is finished!" and then, in the serenity of immortal hope, he died, when the words of filial trust had just passed his lips, "Father! into thy hands I commend my spirit."

O, when the dark and terrible hour comes to man, when wild delirium is foreshadowed, and the universe is becoming a blank, the soul renews its strength by casting its eye to the cross! To the body is then traced what might otherwise be deemed a hopeless abandonment of the soul. I have seen the Christian, with a face dark with the writhings of bodily anguish, find attraction in that feature of the cross; and the poor bigot, who would deny to the dying sufferer the possession of a sufficing faith, because of some wanderings of mind, has felt rebuked when reminded of the speech of Jesus.

The cross is all beautiful, it is all attraction. It rebukes the attempt to drown reason, and animates to the firm endurance of evil. It sanctifies fidelity to home-affections, and the trust to virtuous friendship. It inspires the truest heroism, and bids us remember the union of body and mind. It opens the true source of renovating energy in the Father's love. It prompts to a forgetfulness of human scorn and contempt, in the unswerving adherence to eternal truth; and over all, and above all, and through all, it makes the mild light of forgiving and enduring love to shine, without a shadow to darken its beauty.

We should go to the cross to see and feel all this — it is all there. And beyond this, we should confess the mystic union of that death with the salvation of our race. It has such a union; and we gratefully own the knowledge of it, and of faith in its complete efficiency. We can speak of the cross, remembering the assurance of the august Sufferer, "And I, if I be lifted up from the earth," — speaking of the death he should die, — "will draw all men unto me;" and we can use the language of confidence concerning the relation of that fact and the destiny of our race, as heirs, through infinite grace, of immortal life. The ground of our hope is to us as certain as the

Digitized by Google

reality of the fact that Christ died. We can speak of it with the same fulness and earnestness as our author speaks of "justification," which he says is "matured, the moment of belief — once, forever. It varies not with their changeful frames and feelings, nor with the mutable evidences of piety within their own bosoms; because it rests on the great fact that never changes — the Redeemer's obedience to the death of the cross."[22] Many a day may be passed "under the hidings of God's face;" he says, "you may lose your hold on the cross, but the cross will not lose its hold on you."[23]

Why should we not value more the symbol, instead of yielding it to one portion of Christendom? There may be a horror of symbols, as superstitious as is a blind devotion to them. While intellect is united with matter, it must look through matter to get at spirit. The universe is but a symbol. The humblest and frailest form of matter may become dear to us by the infusion of a thought, a memory, an association. And for no good reason can we reject the use of the form of the cross as a symbol, while we acknowledge that all things affect us only accordingly as intellectual and spiritual associations are connected with them. Protestant children seem to have more love of the symbol of the cross, than their seniors. I shall not forget the impression made on my mind in favor of that form, by the holy face which gave a charm to the affectionate tones and words of a little boy, who paused in his play to speak to me. He had a kite which he had been trying to ornament, and, with some strips of gold paper, he had formed the cross upon it. He sat for awhile silently contemplating, as he gazed on the symbol there, and then spake to me: "I love to look at the cross," said he, "for it makes me think of Jesus, and I love to think of Jesus, for I never think of him without remembering little Mary. It is good, is it not? I know," he continued, "what Jesus came into this world for — to save us from our sins; he *was* our Saviour, and he *is* our Saviour." I trust he will never lose his hold on that symbol. It will be to him a means of spiritual power, for that is an aid which reminds us of our spiritual relations, and inclines us to religious thought. Thus "a little child" may be placed "in the midst of the disciples." H. B—N.

[22] p. 116. [23] pp. 117, 118.

Digitized by Google

Art. XVIII.

Justin Martyr; or, the Orthodox Faith, A. D. 150–165.

S. Justini Philosophi et Martyris Opera. Recensuit, Prologomenis Adnotatione ac Versione instruxit, Indicesque adjecit Joann. Carol. Theod. Otto, Jenensis Philosophiæ Doctor, Theologiæ Candidatus, Societatis Latinæ Jenensis et Historico-Theologicæ Lipsiensis Sodalis Ordinarius. Præfatus est L. F. O. Baumgarten-Crusius, Professor Jenensis. Jenæ etc. 1842. 8vo. 2 Tom.*

It will be recollected, perhaps, that the Apostolical Fathers, whom we passed under review in an article, some time ago,[1] were supposed to represent pretty fully the state of opinion in the common mass of Orthodox Christians, during the first half of the second century. We may reasonably infer that the same sentiments continued to prevail, in that party, for a considerable time afterwards; since it is not usual for the people at large, in any party, to change their general views at once, especially their accustomed modes of thinking, even though a new set of teachers appear at their head. Still, in examining the Christian remains of that period, there is a remarkable fact which cannot but strike every observing reader, namely, that, when he passes onward from the works of the Apostolical Fathers, he suddenly and forever loses sight of their peculiar forms of thought, and enters, at a step, on a series of ecclesiastical writings very different from theirs in style, literary culture, and range of speculation. This indicates that a new element was then gaining the ascendency in the Orthodox party. Let it be remembered, that the whole body of professed Christians was, at that time, divided off, or rather was in the process of dividing off, into three grand parties, as we have heretofore shown: the Judaizing sects; the Gnostic heretics; and the Catholic or Orthodox church. What we would here

* In the following article, when quoting Justin, we shall refer to the *chapters* of Otto's edition; but as this, though the latest, is not the most common, we shall also give the *page* of the "Editio Coloniensis," which is marked in the side margins of many of the subsequent editions.

[1] Universalist Quarterly, vol. i. art. xxviii.

Digitized by Google

remark, is, that even the Orthodox church itself may be distinguished, though not properly speaking divided, into two classes: the great mass of common, uneducated believers, on one hand; on the other, the smaller, but more influential, number of scholars, who had been converted for the most part from the Greek schools of philosophy, and who were about to take the lead in fashioning the ecclesiastical doctrine.

We now introduce Justin Martyr, as representing, generally, the state of opinion in this latter class, about the middle of the second century. He was not, indeed, the first to bring the Greek philosophical speculations into the church. We discover, by casual notices left us, that these elements were at work there, before his day; probably, from the very time of the apostles. As early at least as the reign of Hadrian, (say, A. D. 120–130,) there was Aristides, "an eloquent Athenian philosopher," who presented to that emperor an Orthodox Apology for the Christians, but still retained his philosophic dress and profession. A very significant fact! the natural inference from which is confirmed by the observation of Jerome, that his work was interwoven with philosophical notions, and that he was afterwards imitated by Justin.[2] Other instances are probable; as in the case of Quadratus, who also, about the same time, presented an Apology for the Christians, to the same emperor; and of Agrippa Castor, "a very learned man," who wrote against the Gnostic heretic, Basilides. All these works, however, have perished; so that, on looking back, in our day, through the ecclesiastical writings now extant, we see the philosophico-Christian speculations first come out into plain view in the works of Justin Martyr. He may, therefore, be regarded as forming, for us, an important epoch in dogmatic history.

The very scanty biographical notices we have of him, will be useful in showing the course of his religious development, and in fixing his position in the Christian community. He was born, doubtless of Greek parents,

[2] "Aristides philosophus . . . . . apologeticum pro Christianis obtulit, contextum philosophorum sententiis; quem imitatus postea Justinus," &c. Hieron. Ep. 83, ad Magnum. Opp. Tom. iv. p. 656. ed. Benedict.

Digitized by Google

at Flavia Neapolis, the ancient Sichem, in Samaria, probably between A. D. 89 and 103. Accordingly, he grew up, a heathen, under the shadows of Mount Ebal and Mount Gerizzim, and within sight of Jacob's well. During the early part of his life, the remnant of Jews, left in Palestine after the destruction of their country, was "an abhorring unto all flesh;" and this may help to account for the apparent fact that he never had any sympathy, nor perhaps much intercourse, with them, and that he was utterly ignorant both of the ancient Hebrew and of their later dialect. Like many others of the seriously disposed heathens, in that skeptical age, he felt an unappeasable longing for divine truth and religious peace. These he sought, of course, in the schools of philosophy; first among the Stoics, then among the Peripatetics or followers of Aristotle, and afterwards among the Pythagoreans. But all in vain. At length he applied to the Platonists; and their mode of contemplating incorporeal essences, especially their peculiar theory of "ideas," seemed to give wings to his mind. With his characteristic enthusiasm and credulity, he confidently hoped ere long to attain to the direct contemplation of God. To pursue his meditations undisturbed, he retired into a solitude near the sea. But here he accidentally met with an aged man, a Christian it appears, who soon convinced him that the method prescribed by the philosophers could never lead him to his object; and who recommended, for this purpose, the writings of the prophets, "They are far more ancient," said he, with reference to the great authority which antiquity then bore, — "they are far more ancient than "all who are regarded as philosophers. Blessed and just "men, and dear to God, they spoke by the divine Spirit, "and foretold future events, that are now taking place. . . "..... He who reads and believes them, will be "thoroughly instructed in the beginning and end of things, "[the great points of inquiry, then,] and in the subjects "which a philosopher ought to know. They use no "proofs; for their testimony to the truth is above all need "of proof; and, then, the past and present fulfilment of "their predictions compels us to believe them, — though "they are indeed worthy to be believed even on account of "the wonders they performed. They celebrated God, the

Digitized by Google

"Father and Maker of the universe, and announced his "son, Christ. . . . . But, before all things, pray that "the gates of light may be opened to thee; for none can "perceive and understand these things, save such as God "and his Christ endow with wisdom."[3] Justin had, on some former occasion, been struck by the fearlessness of the Christian martyrs in meeting death, and had felt that the popular charge, of licentiousness, against such men, could not be true. When he reflected, now, on the old man's words, he was seized with a strong desire to read the works of the prophets and apostles; and on examining them, for the first time as it would seem, he found there "the only sound and useful philosophy. In this way, and "by this means," adds he, "I became a philosopher,"—implying that, to him, the gospel had the peculiar character of a philosophical system. Indeed, he sometimes calls it by this name,[4] and every where regards the intimations of it in the Old Testament as one of the sources whence the genuine elements in the Greek speculations were borrowed or stolen.

Such was his conversion. It has been usually dated, on conjecture, a little after A. D. 130. None can question the earnestness of his piety, and his entire devotedness to his religion. It was a new life, thoroughly pervading his soul. But he always retained his faith in many of the Platonic principles, especially in the theory of intellectual "ideas," by which he also developed some of his Christian doctrines; and he never laid aside either the robe, or the profession, of a philosopher. He became, however, Eclectic rather than exclusively Platonic, in his speculations. It would seem that he soon left Palestine. Whether he went to Alexandria in Egypt, the hot-bed of his peculiar species of Eclecticism, is uncertain; and the only ground for supposing that he was ever in Ephesus, is, that the scene of his Dialogue has been said, by Eusebius, to be laid there. About A. D. 150, we find him at Rome, or its neighborhood; where he remained, perhaps the larger part

[3] Dialog. c. 7, p. 224, D, 225. See also, Apol. ii. c. 12, p. 50.

[4] Dialog. cum Tryph. cap. 2, p. 218, C. This passage is sometimes quoted as an example of Justin's homage to philosophy. But by philosophy, here, he means the supposed philosophy of the Scriptures. See the following context to cap. 8.

Digitized by Google

of the time, till the end of his life. Here, he addressed a very bold and earnest Apology for the Christians, to the Emperor Antoninus Pius; and another, to the succeeding emperor, Marcus Aurelius, A. D. 150–162. In these, he seeks, not only to defend his brethren, but also to demonstrate Christianity against heathenism. It was probably at Rome, too, that he wrote his dialogue with Trypho, in which he argues the gospel, at considerable length, with the Jews. We have, therefore, in these three works, a pretty full exhibition of his sentiments in their mutual relations as a systematic whole, and also in the bearings, which he at least supposed they had, on both of the prominent religions of his day. The other pieces, that now go under his name, are of somewhat doubtful genuineness.

At length, the fate he had seen many of his brethren suffer, and which he had for some time expected, came upon himself. By the agency of his enemy, Crescens, a Cynic philosopher, he was arraigned at Rome, and led forth to martyrdom, about A. D. 163–168. His works, of which several are lost, had much influence on subsequent writers of the church; and his name, partly on account of the early period in which he flourished, has always been one of the most celebrated, among those of the Orthodox fathers.

We naturally turn back to the age in which he lived, and try to conceive of the world as he saw it. By much reading, and by much patient thought, we may perhaps succeed in bringing up before us the state of things that lay around him; but, after all, can we look at it through his eyes, with his faith and imagination? In this case, the old Roman empire, that we have read so much about, or the civilized world of that day, with which it was coextensive, will present some aspects rather strange to our habits of thinking, and wholly unnoticed by modern historians. To Justin, it was little else than the great battle-field on which the spirits of heaven and those of hell were waging their contest. We must not take this for a rhetorical figure. Wheresoever he turned, *there* they were, unseen indeed, but really and personally present, acting through men, and thus carrying on all the religious movements of nations and individuals. Let us make the

Digitized by Google

idea our own. The infernal powers, alas! are as yet everywhere predominant, but chafed, exasperated, driven to desperation, by the rapid success of the divine agents, which threatens approaching overthrow to their long-continued domination. This invisible struggle, this working and counterworking behind all the outward scene, is the object on which Justin's most familiar regards are fixed. The grandeur of "the eternal city," the immensity of her domain, her "trebly hundred triumphs," all that touches the sympathy of our worldly ambition and pride, must be passed by unnoticed, for they are nothing to him. Only their bearings, at least, on the great spiritual conflict, can for a moment engage his attention. For the same reason, we must shut our eyes on the monuments of architecture, statuary, and painting, that survive; unless we will view them but as the alluring baits of evil demons, who first suggested them, in aid of idolatry, and who continue to patronize them for that purpose. The stores of Grecian poetry and philosophy (the Roman seem unknown to our author,) are as yet full, unwasted by the sad havoc of subsequent ages. In these, Justin takes much interest, for he discovers in them, not indeed the charm of genius which others admire, but gleams of that divine truth, which ancient sages stole from the far more ancient Moses, or which the universal Reason, the divine Word, or *Logos*, has always been directly imparting to the human mind. Every phrase, in Homer or other poets, that seems to recognize a supreme God, every expression in them, that corresponds, or that can be made to correspond, with some significant term in the Scriptures, every casual figure even that resembles any fact in sacred history, we must take, with him, for an indubitable vestige of such revealed truth; and he finds the more instances of this kind, because he cannot distinguish between the genuine works of the old classic writers, and the recent Christian forgeries, no matter how bungling, that are circulated under their name. And then, again, in all the better systems of Greek philosophy, he sees the scattered, misarranged elements of divine knowledge and Christian doctrine; especially in Platonism, which, however, he studies chiefly in its Alexandrian modifications, such as appear in the works of Philo Judæus, of the preceding century. But the book in which

Digitized by Google

all these scattered rays of heaven's light are brought together in one living glow of splendor, is the Scriptures, rather of the Old Testament, however, than of the New; for the latter is, as it were, but the simple key to unlock the profound mysteries of the former. The Pentateuch, the Psalms, and the Prophets, are, to him, a series of divinely contrived innuendoes, enigmas, types, and allegories, all pointing out beforehand the history of Christ and of his kingdom, even to the minutest particulars, or covertly teaching the abstract and philosophical truths now plainly declared in the gospel. A wonderful, a complete demonstration, this! prepared by the immediate dictation of Omniscience, ages before the realities themselves appeared, and thus furnishing such a proof of Christianity as needs little corroboration.

It will amuse, perhaps instruct, us, to put ourselves in Justin's place, and with him look out somewhat more distinctly on the religious affairs of the world, at that time. We see, then, Polytheism universal; at least everywhere prevalent. Judaism is, indeed, making some secret advances, not very distinguishable, however, at a cursory survey; and Christianity is fast spreading, openly among the slaves and the common people, and more silently with many of a higher class. But all these are only exceptions from the general state of things. Wheresoever we look, the hateful ensigns of idolatry meet our view, in city and in the country, in streets, in all places of resort, in private dwellings, on all public edifices, by fountains, streams, groves, forests, and mountains; all the face of nature itself is heathen,—the constellated heavens, as well as the earth. The accursed rites of the popular religion are commingled, integrated, with all social and public life, and waylay us, as it were, in all our intercourse with the world, whether in palace or in hut, with philosopher or clown. How watchful must we be, lest we ourselves be unwarily drawn into these impieties, by the force of our own former habits, or by thoughtless conformity to universal custom! exposed, as we daily are, by the thousand-fold necessities of traffic and common sympathy. These altars innumerable, these shrines and temples that rise on every hand, are all devoted to the native and foreign gods; for the Christians have no temples, as yet, nor consecrated places of worship. Here,

Digitized by Google

on this altar, we may see the humble offering of some private devotee, to Jove or Neptune, or other false divinity; there, the idol-statues are crowned with garlands by troops of youths and maidens. Sometimes we see the priests and priestesses going about in their robes, or performing solemn sacrifice; and then, again, on festival-days, or in seasons of danger, they march forth, with the citizens and chief magistrates, in pompous processions, while the delighted populace give loose to devotion, revellings, and debauchery, in the name of their approving gods. The mythological fables are still inculcated with as great an assiduity as ever, though disbelieved by most of the educated class, and maintained in seeming respect chiefly for the sake of the ignorant and superstitious multitude. Indeed, could we enter into the confidential thoughts of the philosophers and men of science, we should find the whole host of popular deities already rejected, and held but as a nullity. We, however, will try to regard them, as Justin does, in a more discriminating light, — as really existent beings, who actually haunt the places consecrated to them; evil spirits, who have assumed their several names and titles, and set themselves up for gods, to enjoy the popular homage, and to feed on incense and the steams of sacrifice. They are, indeed, miscalled and misconceived, but they are no figment of the imagination, — would that they were! They are the old demons, veritably present here, operating invisibly, and moving the people to practise idolatry, of which they are the authors. They fabricated all the schemes of heathen mythology, in aid of this false worship; they invented all its absurd fables. It is very shocking to think with what impious cunning the demons have sought to forestall the credit and influence of Christianity, by audaciously contriving these fables in studied imitation of the gospel history, which they guessed out, though imperfectly, from the Hebrew prophets. They work counterfeit miracles, to blind the world, and are the secret agents of all witchcraft, magic, auguries, oracles, and divination, which they instigate in order to match the predictions of the divine spirit. Vain attempt! We frequently see them working, in the distorted features, preternatural impressions, or convulsive fits, of those persons whom they possess, but whom they sometimes

Digitized by Google

persuade the skeptical to regard simply as insane or epileptic. After all, we may exult in the consideration that the terrible power of these evil spirits is at length manifestly broken; since it is necessary only for a Christian to adjure them by the name of Jesus Christ, in order to dissolve their spells, and make them leave their victims: an experiment frequently performed. It is for this cause, as well as on account of the rapid progress of Christianity, that their habitual hatred of God's truth is now exasperated into rage. They seek every way to revenge themselves on the gospel; set on foot the persecutions against its believers, stir up the magistrates to arraign them, and the frantic populace to cry out for their blood; and they it is who send forth the Gnostic heretics to corrupt the Christian doctrine itself.

These were the scenes in which Justin lived. His world was literally a "possessed" world, demoniac; all, except the church. If we turn to see how the Christians, on the other hand, were regarded by the idolaters, we find them to have been Atheists, in the popular estimation, because they denied the gods, and had neither altar, statue, temple, nor costly rites; indeed, no rites whatsoever, except a few of the very cheapest kind, that were rather an apology for the want of them. Such a God as theirs, represented by no sensible form, acknowledged by no sacrifices, offerings, nor public parade, and not even honored with a professional priesthood,—such a religion was utterly inconceivable to the multitude; what could it be, but Atheism? It is true, the more discerning must have seen, at once, the aggravated injustice of this reproach. But their partialities would lead them to connive at the vulgar mistake; and Justin felt the matter imposing enough to call for serious and repeated refutation. Another prominent charge, from which he was obliged to defend his brethren, may, at first, appear equally amazing, especially as coming from the worshippers of such gods as Bacchus and Venus. The Christians were commonly accused of practising the grossest vices and most unnatural abominations, in the private meetings, which they, indeed, held for communion in the Lord's Supper, and other religious purposes. But, on second thought, it is easy to account for such charges, since they have been preferred, by turns, against every

Digitized by Google

kind of secret institutions. They have always an adequate cause in the inherent suspiciousness of the vulgar, when inflamed by strong prejudice; to say nothing of the lust of slander in dishonest partisans.

We need not enlarge on the hatred and abuse with which the Christians were everywhere treated, nor on the scorn in which they were held. Neither is it necessary, here, to describe the persecutions they suffered for their religion, while nearly every other form of worship was tolerated. This part of their story, together with that of their habitual readiness to meet death, their constancy in trial, and their triumph in the hour of martyrdom, has been often and well told. Let us return to Justin, and trace out his doctrine, as an example of the speculations that distinguish the philosophical portion of the Orthodox church, at that time. We shall there find the germs, nearly mature, of the system that soon became the standard of faith.

It is difficult to reproduce, in modern language, his ideas on the first of all points in theology. He holds one supreme God, the Maker and Father of the universe, self-existent, self-dependent, eternal, dwelling always above the heavens, and never coming down to earth;[5] yet the efficient Governor of the whole, and the original source of every thing that is good. He is *the* God, (so Justin usually calls him by way of eminence,) and, so far as appears, exists in one person only.[6] He is ineffable, has no name; for a name would imply some one older than he, to impose it upon him.[7] The terms by which he is called, such as the God, the Lord, the Maker, &c., are but titles expressive of his office or character.

Before the creation of the world, (it would seem, however, not a great while before this event,[8]) he saw fit to

[5] Dial. c. 56, p. 275, and c. 60, p. 283, B.

[6] Of course, there was no occasion for Justin to *assert* that the supreme God was of one person only, since the contrary had not, at that time, been imagined. His utter silence, under the circumstances, is as conclusive as negative proof can be.

[7] Apol. i. c. 61, p. 94, D. Apol. ii. c. 6, p. 44, D. et *al.*

[8] Apol. ii. c. 6, p. 44, E. Dial. c. 62, p. 285, E. One object of God in speaking forth, or thus begetting, the Logos, was, to provide an agent for the creation of the world.

Digitized by Google

speak forth his wisdom, or reason, which had hitherto belonged to him simply as a perfection of his own being. But when thus expressed, or put forth, in word, it became not only a spoken idea and purpose, but a separate agent also, having personality and self-consciousness: a substantial being, consisting of that divine energy and wisdom of which he was the utterance. This is the "Logos," the Word of God, the Son of God, begotten in this manner before all things, but not strictly speaking created, since he proceeded forth directly from the Deity, with no other change than that of being substantiated, as it were, from a mere attribute into a person. Not, however, that the original wisdom or reason of the Deity was thereby diminished, any more than our reason is diminished when we give it utterance, or than a fire is diminished when another fire is kindled from it. All these whimsical notions, Justin seems to have taken, without any modification, from the corrupted Platonism of Philo Judæus; but, having once adopted them, he naturally looked for them in the Scriptures,— where, indeed, he might readily find anything, with his method of interpretation. He saw the whole recognized in several passages, especially in what Solomon says of Wisdom, Prov. viii.; and it was logically implied, or casually referred to, in a great multitude of texts.

Still following Philo Judæus, Justin holds that this Logos himself is *a* God,—"another God;"[9] of the same nature with Him by whom he was thus begotten, yet not the same being. He is not one with Him, in number; but in agreement of will only.[10] What appears to dis-

[9] Justin *usually* prefixes the article to the term God, when he means the Supreme, and omits it when he means, by that term, the Logos, or Son. For an example, see Dial. c. 56, pp. 275–279. That the Logos was "another God" than the Creator, he argues at great length, Dial. cc. 55–62, pp. 274–286, particularly p. 275, C. "I will try to show you, if "you understand the Scriptures, that there is, and that there is men- "tioned, another God and Lord, who is under the Creator of the uni- "verse; who also is called an angel, because he announces to men "whatsoever the Creator of the universe (above whom there is no other "God,) wills to be announced to them."

[10] Dial. c. 56, p. 276, E. "I will try to convince you that this same "God, who, it is said and written, appeared to Abraham, and to Jacob, "and to Moses, is another than the God who made all things; another, "I say, in number, but not in purpose; for I hold that he never did any "thing but what he who made the world (above whom there is no other "God,) willed that he should do and say."

Digitized by Google

tinguish him from the supreme God, is, that he is not personally self-existent, nor personally existent from eternity, but that he received his separate being from the latter, in the manner described; that he conforms to His will, as the authoritative standard; is His angel, and apostle, and minister, to do His pleasure, and to announce His commands. He is the medium of all communications between the supreme God and men; and in fulfilling this office, he frequently appears to human view, as we find by numberless cases mentioned in the Old Testament; and he goes to particular parts of the world, while the invisible Deity never leaves his abode above the heavens.[11] Whenever it is represented that God appeared to men, or talked with them, whether with Abraham, Moses, the children of Israel, or the prophets, &c., it is this secondary God who is meant.[12] At the appointed time, he condescended to be born of a virgin, and to become man; having been anointed by the Creator, and thus invested with his peculiar office as the Lord Jesus Christ,—the term Christ signifying the Anointed. In this last named particular, Justin departs from Philo Judæus, by recognizing the Logos as the Messiah.

But he again follows him in the opinion that the Logos, or Son, was also the agent by whom the supreme God made all things.[13] It was to him that the latter said, (Gen. i.) "Let *us* make man;" and, again, "the man hath become as one of *us:*" expressions, which show that there were at least two, in number, engaged in the work.[14] The world having been thus created, the general care of it was delegated to the Logos, the secondary God; though the more immediate superintendence was given to the

[11] Dial. c. 56, p. 275. Justin argues that the God who appeared to Abraham, was sent, according to Moses, by another God, "who always "remains above the heavens, is visible to no one, and never converses "directly with any one; and whom we must understand to be the "Maker and Father of the universe." Again, Dial. c. 60, p. 283, B, when *a* God [i. e. the Logos, according to Justin,] appeared to Moses in the burning bush, he remarks, "no one whosoever, if he have the "least sense, will dare to say that the Maker and Father of the uni-"verse, leaving all things above the heavens, appeared in a particular "spot on earth."

[12] See Dial. cc. 55–62, pp. 274–286, et *al.*

[13] Apol. ii. c. 6, p. 44, C, D.

[14] Dial. c. 62, p. 285.

Digitized by Google

angels. It was he, accordingly, who appeared to the patriarchs, Moses, the prophets, &c., in all the divine communications made to them, under the Old Testament; it could not be the invisible, unapproachable Supreme, for whom the Jews mistook him. The Logos pervades all things. He is diffused, in a greater or less degree, through all minds, as true Reason; and the imperfect participation of his divine elements, "the implanted seeds of him," may be seen in all the wise and good, of all ages, whether Gentiles, or the chosen saints among the Jews. "Whatsoever "of excellence the [Greek] philosophers and lawgivers per-"ceived and uttered, they wrought out by a partial discovery "and contemplation of the Logos. But since they did not "know all things of the Logos, they frequently contradicted "themselves," that is, mixed up error with the truth. But, (again departing from Philo,) Christ is the entire Logos; and, accordingly, the Christians, who believe in him, have, not only the scattered elements that others possessed, but the whole truth.[15] They also worship him, next after the supreme God; but, then, it was the latter who conferred on him his right to divine homage.[16]

Such are Justin's views of the Logos; and, consequently, of the rank which Christ held, by the appointment of the Father, in the order of beings. At the same time, however, he tells the Jews, with whom this doctrine, of such a secondary God, was highly blasphemous,[17] that some of the Christians, (evidently meaning some of the Orthodox,) held that Christ was a mere man; and he

[15] Apol. ii. c. 10, p. 48, B, C, and c. 13, p. 51, C, D.

[16] Dial. c. 65, p. 289, E. and c. 93, p. 321. "He who loves *the* God "with his whole heart and his whole might, and is full of pious affections, "will pay homage to no other God; but, *at God's command*, he will "pay homage to that angel [Christ,] who is loved by the Lord and God "himself." In the former passage here referred to, Trypho objects to the worship of Christ, because it is written, (Isa. xlii. 8,) "I am the Lord; that is my name; and my glory I will not give to another." Justin replies, that he will show him, from this very text, that "*the* God "*gave* his glory to his Christ alone," and to none other; which he proceeds to make out, after his fashion.

[17] Trypho, the Jew, is shocked at Justin's blasphemous doctrine of another God besides the Maker and Father of the universe; especially, of a God born and crucified. Dial. c. 38, p. 257, C, and c. 39, p. 258, and c. 48, p. 267, B, and c. 56, p. 277, E. See, as a specimen of his language, Universalist Quarterly, vol. i. pp. 334, 336. Note.

Digitized by Google

seems to intimate that they were numerous, — probably were the common believers among his brethren, especially those of Jewish origin.[18]

The world was made, not out of nothing, but "out of unformed matter."[19] Whether matter, in this chaotic condition, had existed from eternity, does not appear. Man, being created free, yielded to the temptation of the serpent, that is, of the devil, or Satan; whose previous history and origin are not given. We find no intimation that human nature was so changed by this first transgression, as to render its subsequent state essentially different from the original. Adam himself did not thereby lose his freedom to do right, although he was brought under the influence of the serpent, and was subjected, by sin, to physical death; and all his posterity, by imitating his disobedience, each one for himself, suffer the same consequences.[20] But Justin nowhere recognizes the common doctrine of the Fall.

The world was committed to the immediate care of the angels, (*their* creation is not mentioned,) whose charge, however, would seem to have been subordinate to that of the Logos, or Son, who had the general government of the whole. In process of time, some of these angels became enamored of "the daughters of men," as Justin learns from Gen. vi., or rather, from the Jewish interpretations of that passage. They apostatized, and, in the embraces of their mortal paramours, begat the demons. We may here observe, that our author seems to confound the apostate angels with their offspring, the demons, in many of his

[18] Dial. c. 48, p. 267, E. See the substance of the passage in Universalist Quarterly, vol. i. p. 335. Note. — Rössler, remarking on this passage in Justin, (Bibliothek der Kirchen-Väter, Th. i. S. 157. Anmerk.) says, "To me the expression seems plainly to declare that the error (Humanitarianism,) was not prevalent, yet not an uncommon one; and that Justin would leave every one to his own conscientious convictions concerning it."

[19] Apol. i. c. 10, p. 58, B. Also, c. 59, p. 92, C. "'In the beginning, "'God made the heavens and the earth. And the earth was invisible "'and uncomposed; [so Justin reads the text in Gen. i.] . . . . and God "'*said*, Let there be light; and there was light.' Therefore, the whole "world was made, by the Word (Logos) of God, out of *things subjected* "to him."

[20] Justin seldom touches this point. The most definite passage, I think, is, Dial. c. 88, pp. 302–304. See Otto's notes 8–10, and Rössler's note 87, Bibliothek, Th. i. S. 167.

Digitized by Google

notices of their subsequent manœuvres, so that we cannot always distinguish the parts they respectively played. Satan, however, or the devil, was the prince and leader of them all. They soon reduced mankind under their power, by magic, by working on their fears, by threats of torment [in the heathen hell,] and by engaging them in idolatrous sacrifices, of which the foul spirits had need after they were corrupted by lust.[21] They set themselves up for gods, taking the names by which they were afterwards known as heathen deities; and they actually practised the scandalous vices which the poets and mythologists relate of the latter. An impious, abandoned crew! of terrible power and cunning, who kept the human race in constant rebellion against their Maker!

Meanwhile, God was preparing the way to reclaim mankind. His Logos, or Son, universally diffused as the light of divine Reason, was working in all hearts, and illuminating even such of the Gentiles as voluntarily followed his promptings and suggestions. Some of the ancient poets thus had glimpses of the truth; some of the sages, yet clearer views; and Hystaspes and the Sibyl were inspired, so that their writings (Christian forgeries, then circulated under their name,) were worthy to be ranked with those of the prophets. But, to the far more ancient Hebrew patriarchs, the Logos was *personally* sent, to instruct them fully, and to set apart a people for the knowledge and service of God. Through Moses, he gave the Jews the law; which concealed, as under an allegory, the mysteries that were to be subsequently revealed in the gospel, though some of the elements of the latter were already disclosed in the moral and spiritual precepts of the former. The ceremonial ordinances were imposed, partly as a grievous yoke on account of the hardness of the people's hearts, and partly as types of better things to come. Every thing was so contrived, by the Logos, as covertly to point forward to Christ and his religion. The whole of the Old Testament being the work of the Logos, who dictated to the writers, it everywhere alluded, either by allegories or by plainer predictions, to the truths, events

[21] Apol. ii. c. 5, p. 44, B. "—sacrifices, incense and libations; of which they became needy, after they were subjected to the passions of lust."

Digitized by Google

and circumstances that were to be realized in his kingdom. The demons, however, and the apostate angels, partially discovered many of these mysteries, by reading the prophets; and forthwith proceeded to counterfeit them, by their mythological fables. Finding frequent mention of the Son of God, they, in imitation, got up their stories about the sons of Jove, in order to make it believed that what was spoken of Christ, was a fable, like the tales of the poets. These counterfeits they took care to spread abroad, beforehand, among the Greeks and others, wheresoever they foresaw that the writings of the prophets would be eventually received. After all, they did not clearly understand the predictions, and therefore they could imitate them only in a bungling manner. We will give an instance, out of many. Moses, the oldest of all writers, prophesied thus of Christ: "There shall not fail a prince from Judah, nor a ruler from his loins, until He come for whom it is reserved; and he shall be the expectation of the Gentiles; binding his foal to the vine, and washing his garment in the blood of grapes." (Gen. xlix. 10, 11.) The demons, on seeing this prophecy, undertook to imitate it, by giving out that Bacchus was the son of Jove, and the inventor of the *vine;* by introducing an *ass* into his mysteries; and by pretending that after he was torn in pieces he should ascend into heaven. But as it was not said, by Moses, whether He who was to come was the Son of God, nor whether He who was to sit on an ass was to remain on earth, or to ascend into heaven; and as the word *foal* might here mean the foal either of an ass or of a horse, the demons were perplexed. So they said, at a venture, that Bellerophon, a mere man, should ascend into heaven, on the *horse* Pegasus. But when they afterwards learned, from Isaiah, that He should be born of a virgin, and of himself ascend into heaven, then they fabled a Perseus, born of a virgin. And when they found it written in the prophecies, that He should be "Strong as a giant to run a race," (Ps. xix. 5,) they got up the story about the strong Hercules running through all the earth. When, again, they found it prophesied that He should cure all diseases and raise the dead, they invented their Æsculapius. But, with all their shrewdness, it never came into their minds to feign that one of the sons of Jove should be crucified.[22]

[22] Apol. i. c. 54, pp. 89, 90.

Digitized by Google

And so of other mythological fables, which the demons copied, after the same fashion.

The Greek philosophers, also, though with a better purpose, borrowed from the prophets, especially from Moses. From him, Plato took his doctrine of the creation of the world out of shapeless matter.[23] He attempted, also, to interpret the allegory (Numb. xxi.) of the brazen serpent which Moses lifted up (Justin says, on a cross,) in the desert. But Plato, not understanding that this cross represented that of Christ, took it as a figure of the letter X. Accordingly, he said that the Power next after God, (that is, the Logos, as Justin supposes,) was X'd in everything.[24] It was thus that he received from the Hebrew lawgiver, not only his doctrine of the second Power, or Logos, but his knowledge also of the third Power, or Holy Spirit. For Moses mentioned the Spirit of God moving on the face of the waters, (Gen. i.;) and our author is persuaded that Plato alludes to this, and to the third Power, when he says, "And the third class of things round about the Third,"[25] &c. &c.

We have observed that the Old Testament, having been dictated by the Logos, referred everywhere to him and to his administration. Take, for example, the single instance of his cross. Justin sees it prefigured by the tree of life in Eden; for a tree is in the shape of a cross. It was prefigured by the rod with which Moses was sent to deliver the Israelites; by that also with which he divided the Red Sea; by that with which he smote the rock in Horeb; by the branch that he cast into the bitter waters of Marah; and by the pealed rods that Jacob laid before his cattle;[26] for all these were of wood, and so was the cross.* It was represented by Moses, in his battle with Amalek, (Exod.

[23] Apol. i. c. 59, p. 92, C.

[24] Apol. i. c. 60, pp. 92, 93. It is the Greek X, in the text; but, so far as any sense is concerned, the Roman will answer just as well. The passage of Plato, here referred to, is said to be in his Timæus, and to relate to his "Soul of the World."

[25] *Ibid.* This unmeaning quotation from Plato, is said to be from one of the Epistles falsely ascribed to him. The word "Third," is enough to satisfy Justin of its meaning; and "round about" denotes the position of the waters among which the Spirit moved.

[26] Dial. c. 86, pp. 312, 313.

* "*There is a river in Macedon, and there is also,*" &c.

Digitized by Google

xvii. 9;) for, while he prayed with his arms extended, the Israelites conquered; not because of his prayer, but because he stood thus in the shape of a cross.[27] The Old Testament, however, was not the only symbolical record of these Christian mysteries. Nature itself, having likewise been fashioned by the Logos, bore his mark, if we may so speak, and was full of types, referring to him, and especially to the cross, "which is the greatest symbol of his power and government." Justin calls on unbelievers to consider all things that are in the world, and to see how this object is everywhere presented to us. Nothing can be done without the figure of the cross. We cannot navigate the sea without a sail; and is not a sail in the shape of a cross? The plough, with which we till the earth, bears resemblance to a cross; if we dig the ground, or do any other work, we must have instruments of this figure. Even the human form differs from that of brutes, only in its likeness to a cross; for, does it not stand erect, with arms to extend out on both sides? Then, again, there is the projection before our face, namely, the nose, through which we breathe; and to this figure of the cross, the prophet refers, when he says, (Lam. iv. 20.) "The breath before our face, is the Anointed of the Lord."[28] Justin has much more, to the same purpose; but, *Enough!*

It is hardly necessary to say that his method of interpreting particular texts in the Old Testament was as fantastic as the foregoing speculations, and often as laughable. An example, which we shall take at random, may give a better idea of it, than any description. He proves, to the heathens, that Christ was pointed out, ages beforehand, in a prophecy already quoted: "There shall not fail a prince from Judah, nor a ruler from his loins, until He come for whom it is reserved; and he shall be the expectation of the nations; binding his foal to the vine, and washing his garment in the blood of grapes." (Gen. xlix. 10, 11.) Now the Jews had a prince of their own, until Christ came; but, immediately afterwards, they were destroyed by you, Romans. Thus did the prophecy fix

[27] Dial. c. 90, pp. 317, 318. Barnabas has the same conceit.

[28] Apol. i. c. 55, p. 90, C, D. Justin follows the Septuagint rendering of the text in Lamentations: "The breath [*or* spirit] before our face, is Christ the Lord," &c.

Digitized by Google

the time of Christ's appearing. That he should be "the expectation of the nations," is fulfilled in the fact that many out of all nations expect his second coming; "his foal," bound to a vine, was that foal of an ass which stood tied to a vine in a certain village, and on which Christ rode into Jerusalem; "his garment" means those who believe on him; his "washing them in the blood of grapes," signifies that he should purify them by his blood; and this is called "the *blood* of *grapes*," to show, first, that he should have blood, and, secondly, that it should not be human blood, but such as is divinely produced; for the blood, or juice, of grapes, is the production, not of man, but of God.[29] Thus, all is clear. We ought to observe, however, that he generally explains the New Testament in a more sober way; though, even here, he has no claim to skill, nor always to common sense. He seems to regard it rather as a plain statement of the facts, doctrines, and moral principles, that he found so wonderfully foreshadowed by Moses and the prophets. In their writings, he saw all the mysteries of the gospel economy dimly revealed; in those of the evangelists and apostles, only a key to the whole. There is an important consideration, moreover, which we do not remember to have seen presented in its bearings; namely, that in his Apologies to the heathens, and in his Dialogue with the Jews, Justin had no occasion to quote the New Testament, except as a mere *record* of facts and of Christian doctrine. He felt that, to neither of these classes, could he adduce it as inspired authority; for its authority they denied. But, to both parties, he could present the supposed fact that all the details of the Christian economy had been announced, ages beforehand, in a wonderful series of prophecy; and this fact, if clearly made out, would be sufficient demonstration, to the heathens as well as to the Jews, that the whole was founded in the counsels of Omniscience, and had God for its voucher.

The birth and life of Christ, together with the facts and occurrences mentioned in the gospel history, are related as we find them in the four evangelists and in other parts of the New Testament, to which he refers. Sometimes,

[29] Apol. i. c. 32, pp. 73, 74.

Digitized by Google

however, he slightly deviates from the inspired narrative; still it is rather surprising, how closely he adheres to it, considering his extreme carelessness and ungovernable imagination. His numerous allusions and quotations leave no room to doubt that his copies were essentially the same with ours. Of course, we do not mean but that he frequently *explains* the facts after his own fancy; as, when he says it was by the impulse of the demons that the Jews persecuted and crucified our Saviour.

To proceed with his views of Christianity. It was necessary to believe as well as to obey Christ and his doctrine, in order to be saved. Before his birth, however, those who lived according to the instructions universally imparted by the Logos, were Christians; such were Socrates, Heraclitus, &c., among the Gentiles; and Abraham, Elijah, &c., among the Jews.[30] Even under the gospel, Justin allows considerable latitude for diversity of faith. He appears to acknowledge, as his brethren, some who regarded Christ as a mere man, born in the usual way;[31] he disapproves the illiberality of certain Orthodox bigots, who refused to associate with the Judaizing Christians, and thinks they ought to be held in full fellowship, if they will be content to practise the Mosaic rituals for themselves, without forcing the Gentile believers to observe them;[32] and he recognizes the general Orthodoxy of such as rejected his doctrine of a Millennium.[33] Still, he seems to withhold his fellowship from such of the Jewish Christians as made circumcision, and the keeping of the law, necessary to salvation; and the Gnostic heretics meet with no indulgence at his hands. These were sent forth, by the demons, to counteract the gospel by perverting it.

The objects of Christian worship are specified, though somewhat indeterminately. We are, manifestly, not Atheists, as we are called, says Justin to the heathens; for we worship the absolute and ever-existent God, the Maker of the universe; not, indeed, with libations, sacri-

[30] Apol. i. c. 46, p. 83, C.

[31] Dial. c. 48, p. 267, E. "There are some of our own people, who "acknowledge him to be the Christ, but who think him a man born of "man; with whom I do not agree, even though the greater part of "those who believe with me, were to maintain the same." See the substance of the whole passage, Universalist Quarterly, vol. i. p. 335, Note. [32] Dial. c. 47, p. 266. [33] Dial. c. 80, p. 306, D.

Digitized by Google

fices and offerings of blood, since he has no need of these, but with prayer and thanksgiving for every thing we receive. After him, and in the second place, we worship Jesus Christ, who taught us these things; and, in the third rank, the prophetic spirit.[34] Or, as he expresses himself in another passage, "we worship and adore God, the Father "of righteousness and of all virtues; and the Son, who "came from him, and taught us these things; and the host "of other good angels, who follow and resemble him; and "the prophetic spirit."[35] With the latitude of signification in which "worship" and "adore" were then habitually used, it was natural that Justin should mention the host of good angels as objects of such homage; since they had the world under their charge, and, being therefore our immediate Lords by divine appointment, they were worthy of a high degree of reverence. As he was, moreover, refuting the charge of Atheism, brought against his brethren by the heathens, he had a motive to multiply, as far as propriety would allow, the number of those to whom the Christians paid their devotions. It should here be remarked, that, with respect to the first two objects of worship, God and his Son, Justin's views were definite and fixed; but they seem indistinct and wavering with respect to the others. The passage, just quoted, is the only one in which the angels are explicitly recognized as objects of adoration; and "the prophetic spirit" is often spoken of as merely an influence from God, though it is sometimes treated as a person, and sometimes again it is confounded with the Logos. It was that spirit which dictated to the prophets; and this is everywhere regarded as the Logos. Concerning the miraculous conception by the Holy Spirit, he says, "The spirit and power which "came from God, must be understood as nothing else than "the Logos, who is the first-begotten of God; and this came "upon the virgin, and overshadowed her."[36]

[34] Apol. i. c. 13, pp. 60, 61. [35] Apol. i. c. 6, p. 56, B. Many attempts have been made, by changing the reading, or by a forced construction of the passage, to get rid of the unwelcome assertion of Angel-worship here; but the idea is too intimately interwoven in the text to be removed,—as the more candid even of Protestant critics seem now to admit. See Otto's Note, and Neanders Allgem. Gesch. de Christ. Rel. B. i. Abth. iii. S. 693, Anmerk. 2. (Transl. Phil. 1843, pp. 386, 387, Note.)

[36] Apol. i. c. 33, p. 75, B.

Digitized by Google

Christ is the Saviour of men in various ways: by teaching us all truth, being himself the divine Wisdom; by giving us a new and perfect law, for the rule of our lives; by breaking the power of the devil over us, and that of the demons, who tremble at the utterance of his name; and, finally, by imparting immortality to us,[37] — which we receive, probably, through his union with man, and perhaps also through our participation of his body and blood in the Lord's Supper.[38] His blood, his death, &c., are often spoken of, as contributing, in some way, to our redemption; but of the manner in which they operate to this effect, our author has, apparently, no definite idea.

We must be made anew, regenerated, by Jesus Christ. The reason, given by Justin, is, not that we are totally depraved by nature, but that since mankind are altogether passive in their natural birth — come into the world without any exercise of their own will, — and then grow up in ignorance, in vice, and with a corrupt education, it is requisite that they should be born again, with their own free choice. This new-birth is preceded by due repentance, and takes place at our baptism, in which we obtain, by means of water, forgiveness of the sins we have committed.[39] Our righteousness and justification consist in our obedience to God; that is, in believing on Christ, as he has commanded, and in living according to the gospel. "Imputed righteousness," and "justification by faith" in the Lutheran sense, were as yet unknown. Mankind are always free agents, having ability to do good

[37] Apol. i. c. 63, p. 96, D. Dial. c. 30, p. 247, C. "We pray God that "we may be preserved, by Jesus Christ, from the demons, whom "we formerly worshipped, and who are the enemies of piety; "that after we have turned to God, we may be blameless through "Jesus Christ. For we call him our Helper and *Ransomer*, since "they tremble at the power even of his name; and, being now ad-"jured by his name who was crucified under Pontius Pilate, they "are overcome. Whence, it is evident to all that God has "given him this power, that even the demons should be subject to his "name, and to the sufferings he endured in the divine economy." See also Dial. c. 45, p. 264, and c. 100, p. 327, D.

[38] Apol. i. c. 66, p. 98. The body and blood of Christ were truly present in the bread and wine, and received in them. Justin does not indeed add, expressly, that immortality was imparted by them; but this is added by Irenæus, who, in other respects, agrees with Justin on this subject.

[39] Apol. i. c. 61, pp. 93, E, 94.

Digitized by Google

or evil, to obey or disobey. Were their conduct necessitated by fate, they could have no desert, and would be subjects neither of punishment nor of reward. Indeed, "it would then appear that nothing is really virtuous or "sinful, and that we only *seem* to be so." But that men do both right and wrong by their own free choice, Justin demonstrates by the following argument, which is a fair specimen of his metaphysics. Now, we often see the very same person change from right or wrong to the other; whereas, if it were determined by fate that he should be either evil, or good, he would, of course, be incapable of turning to the contrary, as he frequently does.[40] Though God has foretold the actions of men, in many cases, and has predetermined their condition, it is only on the ground that he foresaw the course they would pursue.[41]

"We will explain in what manner we consecrate our-"selves to God, and are made anew by Jesus Christ. . . . . "So many as become convinced of the truth of our doc-"trine, and show themselves able to live accordingly, are "taught to pray, and with fasting to ask of God forgiveness "of their former sins; we praying and fasting with them. "Then they are led by us to where there is water; and "after the manner of new-birth by which we ourselves were "born again, they are born again, for they are washed with "water in the name of the Father of the universe, the "sovereign God, and of our Saviour Jesus Christ, and of "the holy spirit. For Christ said, 'Except ye be born "again, ye shall not enter the kingdom of heaven.' (John "iii. 3.) . . . . . This washing is called *enlightening;* since "they who learn these things are enlightened in their under-"standings. The one thus enlightened is washed in the "name of Jesus Christ, who was crucified under Pontius "Pilate, and in the name of the holy spirit, which foretold, "by the prophets, all things concerning Jesus. . . . . After "he is thus washed, we lead him to where the brethren are "assembled; and make common prayers, with earnestness, "for ourselves, for the one just enlightened, and for all "others everywhere, that we may be worthy to know the "truth, that we may conduct as good citizens, and keep the

[40] Apol. i. c. 28, p. 71, B. And c. 43, pp. 80, D, 81. Also Apol. ii. c. 7. pp. 45, D, 46.

[41] Apol. i. c. 44, p. 82.

Digitized by Google

"commands, so as to be saved with everlasting salvation."[42] Then, the Lord's Supper is administered, and the service proceeds as usual; of which we shall give some account in another paragraph.

The rituals of the Mosaic law were all abolished under the gospel. Indeed, Justin thinks they never were, in themselves, pleasing to God. Though most of them were so contrived as to typify Christ and his religion, they were instituted chiefly as a yoke imposed on the Jews for the hardness of their heart. Of all these obsolete rites, none seems to have been more strenuously contended for, by the Jews of that day, than the Sabbath; and, accordingly, there was none, against which Justin more earnestly or more frequently argued, in his disputes with this people. For your sins and those of your fathers, says he, was it commanded. Those just men, Abel, Enoch, Lot, Noah, Melchizedek, Abraham, and others, down to the time of Moses, kept no Sabbaths; and yet they were approved of God. God himself carries on the government of the world on this day, as on all other days; even your high-priests were commanded to make offerings on this day as on other days. The gospel requires you to keep a Sabbath all the time; and ye think yourselves pious, for keeping idle one day, not considering why it was formerly commanded you. If ye eat unleavened bread, then, ye say that ye fulfil the will of God. But not with these things is the Lord our God pleased.[43]

Sunday was set apart, as a day for meeting, by the Christians, but on distinct grounds, and without any reference to the Sabbath or to the fourth command of the decalogue.[44] The Lord's Supper was administered every Sunday; but was allowed to none except those who had been received into the church by baptism. If any of these were absent, it was carried to them by the deacons. Its elements were bread and wine, the latter being first diluted with water. They were not common food; they served as a sacrifice and thank-offering to God, and were indeed the flesh and blood of Christ. For we are taught, says

[42] Apol. i. c. 61, p. 93, D, and c. 65, p. 97, C. [43] Dial. c. 12, p. 229, C, and c. 19, p. 236, E, and c. 21, p. 238, and c. 29, p. 246, E. See the whole of cc. 9–29, for his plea against the Sabbath. [44] Apol. i. c. 67, p. 99.

Digitized by Google

Justin, that, in the same manner as Christ, by the word of God, took flesh and blood, for our salvation, so does this food become, by the word of prayer, the flesh and blood of Jesus; according to his declarations, 'This is my body,' and 'This is my blood.' (Matt. xxvi.)[45]

"On Sunday, all [the Christians,] who dwell in city or "in the fields, assemble in one place. Then, either the "memoirs of the apostles, called Gospels, or the writings "of the prophets, are read as long as time permits. After "this, the president of the brethren enforces what we have "heard, and exhorts us to act accordingly. Then, the "common prayers are made; at the close of which, we "embrace each other with a kiss. Bread, and a cup of "water mixed with wine, are next carried to the president, "who takes them, and offers up praise and glory to the "Father of the universe, through the name of the Son and "of the holy spirit, and renders thanksgiving for these "blessings; and all present approve the prayers and "thanksgiving, by saying Amen. The bread, with the "wine and water, is then given, by the deacons, to every "one present, and carried by them to those who are absent. "This food, called eucharist, (thank-offering,) is allowed "to be partaken by none except those who believe our "doctrine, and are washed for the forgiveness of sins unto "regeneration, and who thus live as Christ directed. "Then, they who abound and are willing, contribute what "they choose, each according to his own pleasure; and the "collection is placed before the president. With this, he "helps the orphans and widows, and such as are in want "either through sickness or other cause, and strangers who "have come among us, and, in general, all who need. "We all come together on Sunday, because it is the first "day on which God changed darkness and matter, and "made the world, and on which our Saviour, Jesus Christ, "also rose from the dead. For he was crucified on the "day before Saturday; and on the day after Saturday, "which is Sunday, he appeared to his apostles and disci-"ples, and taught them the things we have presented for "your consideration."[46] We may add, here, that Justin

[45] Apol. i. c. 66, p. 98, and Dial c. 117, p. 344, D. [46] In this paragraph, I have given the substance of Apol. i. c. 67, p. 98, C; but I have also made use of cc. 65, 66, pp. 97, C, 98; where some of the particulars are more fully stated and explained.

Digitized by Google

nowhere recognizes any order of ministers in the church, except the "president of the brethren," or presbyter, and the deacons.

With respect to the future state, Justin holds that the souls of all men, at death, depart, not to heaven, but to some other place, — meaning, doubtless, to the Greek *Hades*, the Infernum of the Latins. Here, however, those of the pious have a pleasant abode, and those of the wicked, a worse, according to the popular heathen notion; but all await the day of judgment, to enter upon their final habitations and to receive their full recompense.[47] That any souls enter heaven immediately at death, or before the general resurrection, was one of the damnable opinions that distinguished the Gnostic heretics from the Orthodox.[48] Nor was the devil, or his angels, or the foul demons, assigned, as yet, to the place of their torment.

Two very different advents of Christ, typified by the two goats in the sin-offering, (Lev. xvi. 5,)[49] were foretold by the prophets, and asserted by himself and his apostles: one of them, already fulfilled in his birth and humble life; the other, yet future. In the first, he was without glory or comeliness, a dishonored and suffering man; but the ignominy will be compensated in the second, when he shall come with surpassing glory, amid the clouds of heaven, attended by his angelic host, to raise the bodies of all men, clothe the deserving with incorruptibility, and send the wicked, together with the foul demons, into everlasting fire.[50] Time was, even then, hastening to its close, and there was but a brief period before the latter advent would take place.[51] In Christ's first appearance, so humble and benignant, Justin evidently saw no divine glory; for this, he looked forward only to his return, in fitting pomp, to reward his followers, and to avenge himself on his enemies.

But before that second advent, antichrist was to come, speaking impious and abominable things against the Most High, and to reign "a time and times and the dividing of time," or three years and a half, as foretold in Daniel vii.

[47] Dial. c. 5, p. 223, B. [48] Dial. c. 80, p. 307. [49] Dial. c. 40, p. 259, C.
[50] Apol. i. c. 50, pp. 85, 86, and c. 51, p. 86, C, and c. 52, p. 87. Dial. c. 31, p. 247, E, and c. 35, p. 254, B. [51] Dial. c. 28, p. 245, D, and c. 32, p. 250.

Digitized by Google

He was already "at the door."[52] Another momentous period, too, of much longer duration, was to occur, either between the appearing of antichrist and the general judgment, or between the second coming of Christ and the latter event,—for our author's language seems hardly reconcilable with itself on this point, and betrays, perhaps, a want of definiteness in his own idea. All the thoroughly Orthodox had adopted, from the Jews, the notion of a millennium, with only such modifications as were necessary to accommodate it to Christianity. They expected that Jerusalem would be rebuilt and adorned [perhaps, at the second advent,] and that they should live there, a thousand years of joy, with Christ, and the patriarchs and prophets, as was predicted by Isaiah, Ezekiel, and St. John. We suppose, of course, that a resurrection of the pious dead was first to take place. Justin acknowledges, however, that some, who were otherwise Orthodox, did not believe in the millennium.[53]

At the close of this period, was to be "the general and "everlasting resurrection and judgment."[54] The flesh, as well as the souls, of all men, was to be raised, the world burned, the righteous received to heaven, and the wicked, together with the devil and his angels and demons, condemned to *Gehenna*.[55] Here they are to be punished, "not merely for a thousand years, as Plato says, but with "an everlasting punishment," in fire.[56] "Christ has de-"clared that Satan and his host, together with those men "who follow him, shall be sent into fire, and punished "for an endless age."[57] This consideration, the *ultima*

[52] Dial. c. 32, p. 250. [53] Dial. c. 81, pp. 307, B, 308.

[54] Dial. c. 81, p. 308. [55] Apol. i. c. 19, p. 66, B. "'Fear not "them who destroy you,' says Christ, 'and after this are able to do "nothing more; but fear him who is able, after death, to cast both "soul and body into *Gehenna*.' Now, *Gehenna* is a place where they "are to be punished, who have lived unjustly, and have not believed "the things which God hath taught by Christ." This is the only passage in which Justin uses the term *Gehenna*.

[56] *αἰωνίαν κόλασιν.* Apol. i. c. 8, p. 57, B, and c. 12, p. 59, B, and c. 17, p. 64, E, and c. 18, p. 65. Through the rest of his volumes, everlasting punishment, everlasting fire, &c., are mentioned almost as frequently as in that portion of the first apology covered by the foregoing references.

[57] *τὸν ἀπέραντον αἰῶνα.* Apol. i. c. 27, p. 71, B. This phrase seems to express endless duration more strongly than any other found in Justin.

Digitized by Google

ratio of divines, is very frequently held up, by Justin, as the grand motive to impel men to embrace Christianity and obey its law.

After all, it is doubtful whether he held the absolute eternity of punishment. There is a difference of opinion among his commentators with respect to his meaning on this point: some contending that he used the strong epithets and phrases referred to, with the rhetorical freedom of the Greeks, and that he held the ultimate annihilation of the wicked; while others explain away the apparent assertion of this latter doctrine, so as to make him agree with modern Orthodoxy in the endless duration of hell-fire.[58] The question turns on the construction of a single passage. Justin had argued that souls are not, in their own nature, immortal, since they were created, or begotten; and whatever thus begins to exist, may come to an end. "But, "still, I do not say that souls wholly die; for that would "truly be good fortune to the bad. What then? The "souls of the pious dwell in a certain better place; but "those of the unjust and wicked, in a worse place, expect-"ing the time of judgment. Thus, those which are judged "of God to be worthy, die no more; but the others are "punished *as long as God shall will that they should exist* "*and be punished*. . . . . For, whatever is, or ever "shall be, subsequent to God, has a corruptible nature, and "*is such as may be abolished and cease to exist.* God "alone is unbegotten and incorruptible, and therefore he is "God; but every thing else, subsequent to him, is be-"gotten and corruptible. For this reason, *souls both die* "*and are punished*. . . . . Again: The soul is either "life itself, or else it only possesses life. If it were life, "then it would make something else live, instead of itself; "just as motion moves something else rather than itself. "Now, nobody will deny that the soul lives. But, then,

[58] The former is the decision of Huet (Origen. lib. ii. c. ii. Quæst. 10. § 25,) Du Pin (Biblioth. Pat. Art. Justin,) Daillé (De Usu Pat.,) Rössler (Biblioth. Kap. Justinus,) Ritter (Geschichte d. christ. Philos. B. i. S. 304,) &c. On the other hand, most of his editors think he means only that the soul is not immortal of itself; but not that God will actually annihilate any. This, too, is the interpretation of Cölln (Münschers Handbuch, Hälfte i. S. 64.) Münscher hesitates between the two interpretations, (Handbuch d. christ. Dogmengeschichte, B. ii. S. 483, 484.)

Digitized by Google

"if it lives, it is not itself life, but only partakes of life; "since that which partakes, is another thing than that of "which it partakes. The soul, therefore, partakes of life, "because that God wills it should live; and accordingly "*it will not partake of life, whenever God shall will that it* "*should not live.* For it is not of itself that it lives, as is "the case with God. Even as the body is not always "united with the soul, and as the soul forsakes the body "whenever it is necessary that this connection should be "dissolved; so, whenever it shall be necessary that *the* "*soul should exist no longer*, the spirit which gives it life "will depart from it, and *the soul will be no more*, but go "thither again whence it was taken."[59] The general tenor of this argument is obviously for the annihilation of the wicked, after they shall have suffered what God sees fit to inflict; in which case, we must limit the expressions that seem to recognize an endless punishment.

Such is the general outline of Justin's doctrine, when arranged in some order. We have been obliged to omit several excellent thoughts which he offers, on the common brotherhood of men, the rights of conscience, self-sacrificing devotion to truth, &c.; and we fear that the degree to which the Christian spirit appears to have influenced him, has not been made sufficiently obvious. We have also

[59] Dial. cc. 5, 6, pp. 222, E,—224. The only uncertainty, here, is in the first sentence: *Ἀλλὰ μὴν οὐδὲ ἀποθνήσκειν φημὶ πάσας τὰς ψυχὰς ἐγώ· ἔρμαιον γὰρ ἦν ὡς ἀληθῶς τοῖς κακοῖς*,—whether it should be rendered, 'I do not say that all souls die,' or, 'I do not say that any souls die.' The Greek idiom will *allow* the latter construction; and the next words, 'for that would be good fortune to the bad,' seem at first sight to favor this meaning. But to us it appears that the course of the succeeding argument leaves no room to doubt that the writer was arguing the actual annihilation of some souls, namely, those of the wicked. And the clause, 'for that would be good fortune to the bad,' may refer only to annihilation *immediately* at death. This idea, as distinguished from *ultimate* annihilation, Justin had not indeed expressed; but even a much greater confusion of thoughts is not unusual with him. In another passage, (Apol. i. c. 18, p. 64, E,) he uses the same expression with clear reference to this very thought: "If they "who die, went into a state of unconsciousness, it would be good for-"tune to all the unjust. But since consciousness remains with all "who have lived, and everlasting punishment is appointed," &c. That is, to go into a state of unconsciousness at death, so as to escape all punishment, would be good fortune to the unjust.

Digitized by Google

passed over many of his most silly conceits and notions. But the sketch, very imperfect as it is, may give a tolerably correct idea of his manner of thinking, as well as of his particular tenets, and serve as a specimen of the Orthodoxy that distinguished the Christian scholars of his age. It should be observed, in closing, that, as adulterated as his Christianity was with foreign elements, we ought not to charge the blame on his learning, (which indeed was not great,) but on causes that lay back of it,—on the prevalent habits of thought, in which he and all others had been brought up, and with which they were still surrounded. Whatever was the agency he had in the general work of perverting the gospel, he but shares the fault in common with the more illiterate believers. In this respect, he differs from them only in the fact that his corruptions were of another kind than theirs. The unlearned Apostolical Fathers had, in proportion to the extent of their writings, as many fantastical speculations, as he, and as many anti-christian views. H. B.[2d.]

Art. XIX.

The Seal of Christ's Messiahship.

Jesus Christ is universally received among Christians, as the Messiah of God. The Father hath sealed him as such, "that all men should honor the Son, even as they honor the Father." We do honor him. Honor him as the "Son of God," the "Saviour of the world." We honor him, not merely as a personage who has taught us much truth, who in his life exhibited much of purity, and whom, without harm, we may generally follow; but as one who has taught us nothing but truth, whose life was all purity, and whom we shall ever be safe in following. In a word, we honor him as God's chosen and well-beloved messenger, sent to bestow upon man eternal life—sent to shed around him the resplendent light of God's truth, and to utter with authority the mandates of heaven. "Him," thus commissioned, and therefore thus honored, "hath God the Father sealed." (John vi. 27.)

Digitized by Google

It was needful that Christ should bear the Father's seal. It entitled him to be heard with all the reverence due to God himself. It endowed him with the same authority that Deity himself could claim, when speaking at first-hand to the children of men. Like the king's seal in ancient times, or his signature at the present day, it empowered him to speak in the name, and by the command, of the Power that sent him forth. Hence Jesus saith, "I have not spoken of myself; but the Father which sent me, he gave me a commandment, what I should say, and what I should speak. And I know that this commandment is life everlasting; whatsoever I speak therefore, even as the Father said unto me, so I speak."[1]

But another, though kindred end, gained by affixing God's seal to the "Son of Man," was his designation as the "Lamb of God that taketh away the sin of the world." It was a custom that prevailed somewhat in the East, and particularly in Egypt, to subject the animals designed to be offered in sacrifice to the gods, to a careful examination, for the purpose of ascertaining their fitness for so sacred a use. Those sacrificed to the Egyptian god Apis, must be entirely white. The presence of even one black hair would render them unclean. Their fitness for sacrifice being determined, the priest who had performed the examination, attached labels to their horns, applied wax, and sealed them with his ring, thus making them ready to be offered. "It is not improbable," says a Commentator, "that a similar custom prevailed also among the Jews; since, especially, they were so strictly commanded to have their sacrifices without spot, and without blemish." These sacrifices were a type of the great sacrifice then yet to be offered once for all. Hence Jesus, who was to be that sacrifice, being prepared of the Father, without spot or moral blemish, was sealed with the Father's seal; thus making the type, even in its details of ceremony, strongly significant of the antitype; and proclaiming to the world that its long-expected Messiah had come. Thus by God's seal, Jesus was declared to be the authoritative Revealer of heavenly truth, and the merciful Saviour of sinful man.

We propose now to inquire, what were the means of this important designation? If God's seal serves the

[1] John xii. 49, 50.

Digitized by Google

comprehensive ends which we have now suggested,—if it pointed out Jesus as the Christ, the Oracle of God, and the Saviour of men, then the inquiry, what was that seal? is one of much moment.

The solution of this problem will doubtless be found in one of three positions, each of which can boast able defenders. One finds the seal of Christ's Messiahship in his moral character,—in his high-toned virtue,—in his immaculate goodness, and the spotless purity of his whole life. Another finds it in the correctness of his teachings, in the superiority of his ethics, and in the general adaptation of his principles to the constitution and wants of the human soul. And yet another beholds it in the miraculous powers possessed by him; powers enabling him, at a word, to still the raging tempest, miraculously to feed the famishing multitudes; to heal the sick, the lame, the blind, the deaf, and the dumb; to raise the dead to life again; and to perform all the wonderful works ascribed to him in the New Testament Scriptures. Thus some find that seal in his *Purity;* others, in his *Principles;* and yet others, in his *Powers.* Which of these positions should be regarded as true?

1. I cannot regard Christ's immaculate purity as the seal of his Messiahship; because that purity, resting on its own foundation, could not be, at any given moment during his ministry, sufficiently evident. No one could stand up, as the Messiah passed by, and affirm that he was wholly free from sin. It was true that no sin could be alleged. But an inability to allege wrong, and an ability to allege the absence of all wrong, are two very different things. The one might exist without the other. Hence Christ's entire purity could be affirmed by a spectator, as an unaided witness, only on condition that what he did not know of him, corresponded to what he did know. This might be assumed as an hypothesis; but could not be asserted as a fact. Do not misunderstand me. I say not that *we* have any difficulty in arriving at a knowledge of this fact, through the inspired instructions of the New Testament. In the biographies of the Saviour, all that we have furnished of his life and character, in detailed events, is made to pass before us at once, as it were; thus making his purity, so far, directly evident. But this enumeration of his deeds,

Digitized by Google

manifestly, does not cover the whole ground; since many things, of necessity, remain untold. And did the testimony rest there, we should be in doubt, whether what we do not know of Christ's character, corresponds to what we do know; and, therefore, in doubt whether his entire purity could be truthfully affirmed. But the testimony does not rest there. Having given a variety of examples from among his deeds of righteousness, the inspired penmen sum up the case, and assert the broader fact of his entire purity. Paul utters the general sentiment on this point, when he says, Christ "was in all points tempted like as we are; yet without sin."[2] It is in the light of such testimony that we judge of Christ's character, and arrive at a conviction of his perfect moral purity.

But the circumstances of those who lived in Christ's own time, were materially different. Judaism was their stand-point. The Jewish heavens were over their heads; the whole paraphernalia of the Jewish worship surrounded them on every hand; and the common, though somewhat vague expectation of blessings through a coming Messiah, dwelt in their hearts. Jesus appears before them, claiming to be that Messiah. He delivers to them his message from the Father, calls upon them to forsake the ancient religion, and bids them yield their faith and obedience to the new teachings. But they naturally ask, how know we that this personage is our long-expected Messiah? How know we that his message is from the Father? How know we that we ought to forsake the ancient religion, to which all the prophets have called us, and yield our faith to this new teaching?

Now, the position under examination, supposes that they have the proof of these claims in Christ's entire purity. But it is manifest that this alleged purity must itself be made apparent as a fact, before it can be adduced as proof of any other fact. How, then, shall it be made apparent to them? They cannot flee to the testimony of inspired witnesses, as can we. They have no biographies of the Saviour, to which to appeal, as have we. Jesus stands before them. Some few events of his life they have witnessed. His teachings and claims are submitted to them, and they are called upon to believe in him, because of his

[2] Hebrews iv. 15.

Digitized by Google

spotless purity. Now, have they the requisite data whereon to affirm that purity? It is not enough, I repeat, that they are unable to allege any wrong in Jesus. There are hundreds of others, equally unknown to them as is Jesus, against whom they can allege no wrong. It is not enough that the Saviour exhibits some virtues—performs a deed of charity, speaks a word of kindness, and lends a helping hand to the needy. Hundreds of others, all around them, do the same things. And yet they are not Messiahs, as Christ claims to be. Their virtues are no guaranty that their teachings are true. How, then, can the same virtues in the Saviour, be proof that his teachings are true?

Is it said that the seal lies not in the manifestation of single virtues, but in the fact of the perfectness of his whole life? I reply, *that* is the very fact so difficult to establish. I grant that the fact itself existed, when Christ's life was finished. I grant that all the evidence in the possession of his cotemporaries, supported that fact. But still I allege that they could not, from the very nature of the case, be in possession of the requisite data whereon fully to affirm it. It was, indeed, as yet, an unsolved problem. The entire perfectness of his whole life, is the alleged seal. But a portion of that life was yet to pass. The alleged fact, in its completeness, did not yet exist. So that the entire perfectness of his whole life, at any given moment during his life, could not be affirmed by Deity himself, save prospectively. And as we have before seen, the fact of his entire purity up to a given moment, though really existing as a fact, must lie in so many disjointed items, as respects its proof, and these items must be scattered in so many hands, that they cannot be collected, and their combined force be made at once available. And yet those whom he addressed, are called upon to believe his doctrines at once; because (as the proposition supposes,)—because of his alleged purity; while the truth of his doctrines is no more doubtful than is the fact of his purity.

To push this argument to its last result, it seems evident that, resting upon the fact of Christ's purity alone, its perfectness can never be affirmed by man, except on the ordinary grounds of generalization. We judge our neighbors in the light of all the facts in our possession. If their lives, so far as we know them, have been unexceptionable, we

Digitized by Google

pronounce them good men. But that they never have been guilty of sins, of which we have no knowledge, we cannot affirm. We generalize from what we know. In the same way, resting upon his purity alone, must the world have judged of Jesus. Men could arrive at the general fact of his purity, only by deducing it from all the individual facts in their possession; leaving it still doubtful whether they had considered all the facts which should come into the account. Thus, there would be fair ground, so far as this argument is concerned, for all that conflict of opinion which actually existed, during his first appearance at the "Jews' feast of Tabernacles." "Some said he is a good man; others said, Nay; but he deceiveth the people."[3]

Moreover, it seems to me apparent, that if a knowledge of his perfect purity, be granted to his cotemporaries, the entire truth of his teaching would not follow—at least, not from the mere fact of his purity. We see no uniform law, by virtue of which a man's intelligence, or ability to unfold truth, keeps pace with his purity. His purity may be a pledge of his sincerity, but cannot be a pledge of his ability. I say this, reasoning from purity as a cause, towards truth as an effect. It is not a cause competent to produce such an effect. Reverse the direction of the argument, however, and it has force. Perfect purity as an effect, may imply the possession of perfect moral truth as a previous condition or partial cause. It may also imply the truth of Christ's teachings, by first implying the especial interposition of God in preparing him for such a life, and thence deducing the truth of his teachings,—on the ground that God would not vouchsafe miraculous aid to any personage, save in furtherance of his truth. There is, however, no direct connection between the purity lived, and the truth taught,—by virtue of which the former necessitates the latter. But I will not dwell here. The argument cannot reach this point. The question of his absolute and entire purity, must have remained, so far as his uninspired cotemporaries were concerned, an unsolved problem; and therefore could not have been to them proof of his Messiahship.

Is it alleged here that Deity interposed to overcome this difficulty, and assured the world of Christ's purity by the

[3] John vii. 12.

Digitized by Google

voice from heaven, saying, "This is my beloved Son, in whom I am well pleased?" or, that he authorized John the Baptist to announce him as the "Lamb of God that taketh away the sin of the world?"—as a personage "full of grace and truth?"—thus making at once evident his perfect moral purity? I answer, this may be. But this is shifting the argument. It is not resting on Christ's purity alone, as the seal of his Messiahship; but alleging God's interposition, and the testimony of his inspired servant John, as the seal of that purity itself. And hence this interposition and testimony become the true seal of the Saviour as a teacher; since they are as conclusive to this end, as they are to the fact of his purity; and establish the one, at the same time they do the other.

These are among the considerations, which, in my judgment warrant a denial of the position that the seal of Christ's Messiahship, is found in his purity.

2. Nor can his principles,—the truth of his doctrines, or the superiority of his ethics—constitute that seal. Jesus comes to man, professing to be God's messenger, the bearer of God's truth, an instructer of man in those things which, of all others, he is most concerned to know. But there have been impostors in the world; and how know we that Christ is not one? It is replied, according to the proposition now under examination, that the proof of his claims lies in the truth of his teachings. The truth of his teachings, then, is the seal that his teachings are true. The truth of his teachings, is the very thing to be proved—the very point upon which we want evidence. To suppose, therefore, that *that* truth can be the proof that Jesus is a "teacher come from God," is to suppose that man himself knows beforehand what that truth is. Such a supposition is absurd, since it not only renders a seal of the teacher unnecessary, but makes useless the teacher himself. So apparent is this absurdity, we need not dwell upon it. Will it be said here, that although it is absurd to suppose that man knows, absolutely, what truth is before it is revealed, yet it is not absurd to suppose that the truth, when revealed, will possess such an adaptation to man's moral nature, that, because of its fitness alone, man can affirm its truth? I answer, the fitness of truth to man's moral nature, is readily granted; but that man is able, on the grounds of

Digitized by Google

that fitness alone, always to decide upon the claims of truth, is not granted. In the case of a given number of alternatives, one of which must be true, and all of which, save one, are seen to be at war with man's moral nature, a determination of their fitness or unfitness may be a determination of their truth or falsity. But in the case of a given number of alternatives, all of which are equally adapted to our moral nature, so far as man can discover, (and certainly man's short-sightedness makes such a case supposable,) then fitness ceases to be an adequate ground of judgment. And although the Infinite Mind is capable of always perceiving a superior fitness in truth, the same cannot be affirmed, evidently, of the human mind.

Not only is man finite and circumscribed in his powers, but, when Christianity came to him, it found him exceedingly depraved, and therefore, in some measure, disqualified to judge of that fitness. What might seem to the depraved debauchee, or the reckless depredator upon another's rights, remarkable for its adaptedness, might appear to the pure in heart, as a gross violation of the plainest Christian rules. Both the finiteness and depravity of man's powers, therefore, combine to make fitness an inadequate ground, on which always to judge what is truth.

Many classes of truths, and preceptive truths may be of the number, awaken such responses in every pure soul, on a mere announcement, as furnish presumptive proof of their truth. But there are other classes of truths, among which may be numbered the historic and the prophetic, that must rest upon the authority of him who utters them. They are not self-evident. They do not necessarily commend themselves by their fitness. They often reach out into dim and shadowy regions, where man has little power to follow. The declarations of Christ, touching the destiny of our race, for example, after all the probabilities we can throw around them by analogical argument, must rest mainly on his authority. We do not believe in Christ, because we believe these declarations; but we believe these declarations, because we believe in Christ. Hence, of the two facts, viz., the truth of Christ's declarations, and the fact of his Messiahship, the latter, in respect to its proof in the mind of the believer, necessarily takes precedence; and cannot, therefore, depend upon the former.

Digitized by Google

I know we are often told that "truth is its own authority." That it "needs no voucher," but is competent to stand alone. If, by this, it is meant that truth, when announced, is self-evident, I deny that it is its own authority; and the multitude of sincere differences of opinion among men, abundantly sustains that denial. But if it is meant simply that truth, when perceived to be truth, needs no voucher—that it then carries with it its own weight and authority, by whomsoever uttered—I heartily concur in the position. But this does not affect, in the least, our general argument. The question will still remain, in reference to Christ's teachings, how is their truth to be made apparent? And when we shall have thoroughly weighed this question, we shall be obliged to concede that the truth of much of his teachings rests on his authority as the Messiah; and, consequently, that his authority as the Messiah cannot rest on the truth of his teachings. Neither his purity, then, nor his principles, were the seal of his Messiahship.

But it may be asked, were not Christ's perfectness in truth and purity, in morals, essential to his Messiahship? Unquestionably they were. But they were essential as qualifications for it, not as seals thereof. It was essential that the animals sacrificed to the Egyptian god, Apis, should be entirely white. If even one black hair was found on them, they were rejected as unclean. But though this whiteness constituted their fitness for sacrifice, it was not the seal of that fitness. That was added subsequently, by the individual who had ascertained that fitness. And as none but the proper person could pronounce upon that fitness, so none but the proper person could affix the seal thereof. In like manner, the truth of Christ's doctrines, and the purity of his life, are qualifications essential to his Messiahship, but not the seals of that Messiahship. And as none but God could pronounce upon the qualifications of the Messiah, so none but God could impart to him the seal of miraculous power.

3. There remains but one other alternative. The positions we have now examined, have opened the way for the following proposition: God's seal of Christ's Messiahship lies in the powers He bestowed upon him—in the miracles He enabled him to perform. It was hardly possible that those miracles could fail to beget faith in Christ,

Digitized by Google

as an especial messenger from God. They were works, which no man, unaided of God, could perform; and hence, by implying God's aid, they conferred divine authority upon his messenger. So reasoned Nicodemus: "Rabbi, we know that thou art a teacher come from God, for no man can do the miracles that thou doest, except God be with him."[4] And this ruler of the Jews but gave utterance to the *common* sentiment respecting Jesus: "Many of the people believed on him, and said, when Christ cometh, will he do more miracles than these, which this man hath done?"[5] — thus implying the conviction that he was the Christ. Nor were these convictions confined to the populace who were uninstructed in Christianity. Peter reasoned after the same method: "Jesus of Nazareth, a man approved of God among you by miracles and wonders, and signs, (which God did by him in the midst of you, as ye yourselves also know,) him, ... ye have taken, and by wicked hands have crucified and slain."[6] The declarations of Jesus himself are likewise in keeping with the same argument. Having fed the five thousand men, on five barley loaves and two small fishes, he said to the multitude, who followed him because of what they had seen, "Verily, Verily, I say unto you, Ye seek me, not because ye saw the miracles, [not because ye apprehend the design of the miracles, so as to be led to seek me for the sake of my doctrines, that ye may be saved thereby,] but [ye seek me] because ye did eat of the loaves, and were filled, [and now expect to be fed in a similar manner again.] Labor not for the meat which perisheth, [such as I have just given you,] but for that meat which endureth unto everlasting life, which the Son of man shall give unto you: for him hath God the Father sealed."[7] [That is, by miraculously feeding your bodies, Christ has proved himself empowered of God to give you eternal life.] Thus does Jesus rebuke the multitude, for failing to deduce the legitimate inference from the miracle they had witnessed. In accordance with this position, we find that, when John sent two of his disciples to question the Saviour, respecting his Messiahship, "Jesus answered and said unto them, Go and show John again those things

[4] John iii. 2. [5] John vii. 31. [6] Acts ii. 22, 23. [7] John vi. 26, 27.

Digitized by Google

which ye do hear and see: The blind receive their sight, and the lame walk, the lepers are cleansed, and the deaf hear, the dead are raised up, and the poor have the gospel preached to them."[8] Now we cannot doubt that Jesus understood what was the proof of his Messiahship. Had it been his purity, or the superiority of his teachings, he would have adduced these to the disciples of John. But he does not rest it here. The wonderful works he had performed — these are the evidence on which he relies. And no sooner had Jesus entered upon his public ministry, than we find him going "about all Galilee, teaching in their synagogues, and preaching the gospel of the kingdom, and healing all manner of sickness, and all manner of disease among the people;" thus establishing his claim upon the world's faith. "And his fame," in consequence, "spread throughout all Syria: and they brought unto him all sick people . . . . . and he healed them."[9] But I need not multiply quotations. There can be no doubt that such was the current reasoning of Christ's time, and that it was sanctioned by Christ himself. Such proof of his claims cannot well be mistaken, nor successfully counterfeited. The performance of deeds of apparent righteousness and outward virtue, and the utterance of seeming truths, are kinds of testimony that any man, even an impostor, can adduce in support of his claims, however false or unfounded those claims may be. But none, save those who are delegated from heaven, who are the messengers of God, and who wield supernatural power, can still the raging tempest, raise to life again the four-days' dead, or perform any of the wonderful works ascribed to Jesus of Nazareth.

And to show still more clearly that it is the miraculous in Christ's character that constitutes the seal of his Messiahship, it should be remarked that those who suppose his purity, or the truth of his teachings, to be that seal, do not make any mere degree of purity, or of truthfulness of instruction, constitute it; but they suppose it to consist in the *perfectness* of his purity and truth. Now this perfectness is itself a most conclusive proof of the miraculous interposition of God, in raising up and qualifying the Sa-

[8] Matt. xi. 4, 5. [9] Matt. iv. 23, 24.

Digitized by Google

viour for his divine mission. And it is in this fact, that the strength of this argument lies. No mere man ever lived a perfectly pure life, and taught nothing but truth. Christ, it is assumed, did so live and teach. Hence he must be the especial messenger of God. This argument evidently implies, as its basis and strength, the fact of divine aid in making Christ thus perfect, so that this fact of divine or miraculous aid, becomes, after all, the true seal of his Messiahship.

Thus have we passed in review, too briefly perhaps, the three main positions touching this subject. From the considerations we have adduced, and from the current reasonings of Christ's own time, as shown by Scripture history, it appears that his cotemporaries lodged the seal of his Messiahship in his miraculous powers. The resurrection of Christ, and subsequent ages, may have thrown additional light upon the subject, but they cannot have changed the essential features of the argument.

We have thus far assumed the entire truth of his biographies, and have endeavored to go back of the record, and, standing among the facts as they are alleged to have occurred, to judge the Saviour's claim, as his cotemporaries must have judged them. But we cannot thus approach the Saviour. Removed from him by the intervention of eighteen centuries, the historic pathway is our only means of access. Besides the questions, therefore, submitted to his cotemporaries, we must decide upon the authority of the historic evidence, by which we journey back to their stand-point. This, with us, is the first question. Is it true, as the New Testament Scriptures affirm, that Jesus lived a perfect life, taught only truth, and performed miraculous works? Our argument, thus far, has been with those only who give this question an affirmative answer. But there are those occupying somewhat different ground, who believe in Christ, acknowledge his entire purity and the truth of his teachings, and do not deny the record of his miraculous works, who yet affirm that they can more easily believe in the purity and Messiahship of Jesus, without the miracles, than with them. That the account of his miraculous works is so very extraordinary that they can with difficulty accredit it; and if the proof

Digitized by Google

of his claims lies here, they prefer to grant his claims, and receive him as the Messiah, even without any proof.

But, allow me to ask, what is gained by a position like this? Is any difficulty avoided? Is the miraculous in Christ's life and character dispensed with? Is the divine interposition, in giving us the perfect purity and unmingled truth of the Saviour, no longer requisite? Do not these qualifications, all things considered, presuppose quite as direct, and even a more remarkable exercise of God's agency, than does any single event of Christ's life? I ask not whether the possession of single virtues, and the utterance of isolated truths, presuppose miraculous aid. But I do ask, whether a life, of which every deed, and word, and thought even, reached the very acme of purity and truth, (for all this is granted,) does not presuppose a degree of divine interposition altogether above the ordinary and natural, and which, therefore, is extraordinary and supernatural? Is there not a higher exercise of miraculous power here, than in merely withering a fig-tree, calming troubled waters, or re-animating a dead body? And do not those who assume the position now under examination, doubt the less, at the same time they believe the greater? Do they not stumble at a pebble, while they scale the mountain-top with ease?

But this is not all. The record of Christ's miracles is doubted by them, while that of his immaculate purity is readily granted. Now the relative strength of testimony, regarding it in its mere human aspect, is unquestionably greater for the fact of the miracles, than for the fact of the entire purity of Christ. True, resting upon the same inspired record, both are certain; but when the fact of the inspiration of the record is denied, and the testimony of the historians is received, not as the testimony of inspired men, but as mere human testimony, then we must consider, not what the witnesses say alone, but also their opportunity to know what they say. Now, a miracle, like the raising of Lazarus from the dead, or the withering of the fig-tree, is an event which transpires directly before the eyes of the witness. He is abundantly competent to affirm it, and his testimony must possess all the weight that it can possess in any other case. But it is far otherwise with the fact of Christ's purity. As we have before

Digitized by Google

seen, all the data upon which this fact rests, cannot, in the very nature of the case, come before the historian. We can only arrive at it by the process of generalization. To the miracle, therefore, he can testify from what he *knows;* to the fact of Christ's purity, only from what he *believes*, and believes, too, on the grounds of a doubtful process of reasoning. Hence, it appears evident, that, resting the two points on the credibility of the witnesses, as mere human witnesses, the miracle is the more certain fact. And those who reject Christ's miracles as the poof of his Messiahship, and rest that proof, either in his purity, or the truth of his teachings, take it from its strong-hold, in respect to evidence, and lodge it in a weaker.

Besides, when they have come so far to doubt the record of the miracles, as to leave them out of the account, they may as well go farther, as for the matter of their argument, and deny them outright. This done, Christ's purity, and the truth of his teachings, can no longer be defended. The record of his miracles is interwoven with the whole history of his life. He is represented as adducing them in support of his claims, and voluntarily wearing the honors they legitimately confer. Remove this portion of the record, and you not only stamp the Saviour with charlatanry and imposture, but you destroy the whole superstructure of Christianity. Almost nothing, beyond the mere fact that Christ lived, and was crucified, is as well sustained as are his miracles. Dispute these, and the same bold skepticism could as successfully dispute every pass, down to the very gates of hell.

Now it singularly enough happens, that there are those —and those, too, who claim to be Christians, *par excellence*—who make these denials, and very heroically conclude to meet the consequences. Faith in the miracles? No. They "cannot believe such facts on such evidence!"[10] Christ a standard of perfect purity? Certainly not. "He denounced his opponents in no measured terms," and "did not use courteous speech!"[11] He was a "model-man," to be sure, but beware how you follow him! Jesus an authoritative and reliable teacher of truth? By no manner of means. He "shared the erroneous

[10] Discourse on Religion, by Rev. Theodore Parker, p. 274.
[11] Ib. p. 291.

Digitized by Google

notions of the times respecting devils, possessions, and demonology in general"—"was mistaken in his interpretation of the Old Testament"—"and was an enthusiast, who hoped to found a visible kingdom in Judea, by miraculous aid, as the prophets had distinctly foretold their 'Messiah' should do!"[12]

Such is the Messiah these Christians offer for our reception. But where are the seals of his Messiahship? Not in his miracles; for he wrought none. Not in his perfect purity; for his purity was not perfect. Not in the entire truth of his teachings; for the "evangelists make it appear that he was [often] mistaken." Where, then, shall those seals be found? Is it true, indeed, that Jesus was the promised Messiah? Aye, more! Is it true that the Jewish prophets, who are alleged to have been greatly mistaken respecting the nature of his kingdom, were ever authorized of God to promise a Messiah? Or is this but another sample of ancient folly, yet to be put away? These Christians answer, Cease your questionings. Cast aside your "antiquarian habits."[13] Abandon your "Hero-worship." "Acknowledge no Master but God." Appeal no longer to "old books as the standard of truth and source of light."[14] Receive "religion with its Bible of man—the hand-writing of God."[15]

Surely, a spiritual mist gathers here! I grope my way in thick darkness, and I seem to tread on air! I look for my Lord, but "they have taken him away, and I know not where they have laid him!" I ask after my Master God—and I hear a voice pointing me to "Man"—"Religion's Bible"—"the hand-writing of God." With prayfulness thither I turn, and perchance meet the startling rebuff—Fool, there is no God! And is nothing certain? Nothing certain, but the grave!

Nay; I will not thus be put off. My faith in the Messiah of God cannot thus be shaken. This sacred "old book"—"my forefathers' stay"—is still my "standard of truth." It still tells me of the past, and of the future—of the past, rich in its dawnings of truth, its heroic deeds of noble daring, its promise of coming good—of the future,

[12] Discourse on Religion, by Rev. T. Parker, p. 290.
[13] Rev. T. Parker's Installation Sermon, p. 27.
[14] Ib. p. 27. [15] Ib. p. 9.

Digitized by Google

richer still in the triumphs of that truth; in its deeds of nobler daring; in its glorious consummation of good. It still tells me—and oh! its words are blessed indeed—of Him who aroused the faith of an apathetic world, rose triumphant over death, and ascended to the right hand of God. A. A. M.

Art. XX.

Illustrations of New Testament Words.

LETTER TO THE EDITOR.

Mr. Editor:—In the course of reading, I have gathered up a few passages illustrative of some of the critical points in discussion between ourselves and those of another faith. Of themselves they may not be of any great importance in making up a verdict on these points; but when added to the collections which others have made, and may make in the future, the whole will perhaps have some weight in determining the usage and value of the words and phraseology in question. It has occurred to me, therefore, to throw them together in such form as may fit them for preservation, and future reference in the pages of your Review. If others will do the same, an amount of testimony may be gathered in a short period, without effort, that will help to put at rest some of the mooted points of doctrinal theology; or at least enable us to meet, with facts and proofs, the bold assertions of professedly learned writers and talkers.

Παλιγγενεσια.

This word is found in Matt. xix. 28. "Ye which have followed me in the regeneration (*palinggenesia*,) when the Son of man shall sit in the throne of his glory, ye also shall sit upon twelve thrones, judging the twelve tribes of Israel." In Expositor iii. 20, (new series,) you have given an example from Josephus, showing the word employed to represent the restoration of the Jews to their land, after the Babylonish captivity; and ask if it is not used in Matt. xix. in a somewhat similar sense, "in the new establishment of

Digitized by Google

things," &c. I find, in looking over Schleusner, that the word is variously employed by Greek writers to represent changes passing over the earth and the affairs of men. It is used to describe the renewal of the earth in Spring. Cicero calls the rank and dignity recovered after exile, by the name παλιγγενεσία. Atticus vi. 6. Clement in his Epistle to the Corinthians applies it to the restoration of the world after the deluge. You are well aware that the Stoics constantly employ it to represent that periodical renovation of the physical universe, which held an important place in their philosophical creed—τὴν περιοδικὴν παλιγγενεσίαν τῶν ὅλων, "the periodical renovation or re-establishment of all things." Anton. Medit. xi. 1. Compare v. § 32. x. § 7. see also Leland, Divine Rev. ii. p. 291. *Note.* Schleusner says, that many learned men suppose the word in Matt. xix. to signify the time in which the correction (restoration ?) of the whole human race shall be accomplished by the gospel — "tempore emendatio universi generis humani ope evangelii instituetur. h. e. ineuntibus N. T. temporibus," that is, the New Testament times, or gospel dispensation. Hence he says, the Syriac has rendered it, "*in the new age.*"

Αιων and Αιωνιος.

Ignatius uses αιων in a sense similar to that in which the English word "world" is sometimes used, i. e. "mankind," "the human race." Speaking of the Lord Jesus, his birth and death, he says, "How, therefore, was he made manifest to the world?" εφανερωθη τοις αιωσιν. Epist. ad Ephes. Eusebius uses the word for time indefinite, and adds to its strength by the adjective "much" or "long." Speaking of the Phenician philosophy as set forth by Sanchoniathon, he says of the darkness and chaos which preceded the creation: they continued "for a long time"—δια πολυν αιωνα. Præp. Evang. Lib. i. ch. x. The Orphic verses, according to Grotius, use it in the sense of "life"—φιλης αιωνος, which he translates by "dulcis vitæ," "sweet life." *De Veritate*, pp. 39, 315, Edit. Boston, 1809. Homer has the same expression.

The following I have gathered from Stephens' *Thesaurus Græcæ Linguæ* and Robert Constant's Lexicon.

Digitized by Google

"And these they called *eternal* (αιωνιους) hearing that they had performed the sacred rites for *three entire generations*," τριων γενεων. *In Solom. Parab.* "Alter not the *eternal* limits or boundaries" — ὅρια αἰώνια. *Bud.* An epitome of this work, *Bud.* says on αιων: "Item seculum, id est, 70 annorum spatium, juxta Hieron," — that is, "an age, the space of 70 years according to Hieronymus." And it adds farther, that it is employed by Homer, Herodotus, and Xenophon, as equivalent to the Latin "ævum" or age. Plato has the phrase μεθη αιωνιος, "continual or constant drunkenness."

Aristotle has a passage in which these words are used in a very remarkable manner; and he finds it necessary to add to the force of αιων to make it mean as much as he wishes to express, thus: εξ αιωνος ατερμονος εις ετερον αιωνα, i. e. "from one endless *aion* to another." The passage is in the book *De Mundo*, and is I think a fair offset to that quoted from the same author by Dr. Clarke, and which is appealed to with so much confidence by all his copyists in the controversy respecting the meaning of these words. I refer to the definition of αιων quoted from Aristotle in the Dr.'s notes on Gen. xxi. 33; where he is represented as proving the meaning to be strictly "endless." Now if Aristotle intended to say that the word does signify strictly "endless," and that "no word can more forcibly express the grand characteristic of eternity;" why did he, in the above passage, add another word to increase the force of it? where the need or sense of saying "from one *endless eternity* to another? And even with this addition, he does not convey the idea of *interminable, without limit or end;* otherwise there could not be *another* such period, which the sentence affirms!

Schleusner defines αιων and αιωνιος to mean "any space of time, whether longer or shorter, past, present, or future, to be determined by the persons or things spoken of, and the scope of the subjects." His second definition of αιων is, "The life or age of man; any space in which we measure human life, from birth to death." And he refers Matt. xxviii. 20 to this head: "I am with you alway, even unto the *end of the world*" — συντελειας του αιωνος; rendering it into Latin by "per omnem vitam vestram" — "I am with you alway to aid you *through your whole life*." This

Digitized by Google

is somewhat different from the common interpretation, but worth an examination; and seems supported by the original words which we translate "alway;" being literally "every day." Schleusner shows that the word is so used by Greek writers, and defined by Suidas, Hesychius, &c., to mean, "the life of man," "the time or period of life."

Ψυχη.

This word, it is well understood, is used in reference to the soul and the animal life indifferently, and its signification, in any given passage, is to be determined by the connection and the main drift of the writer. In the course of the controversy respecting its N. T. usage, the Biblical Repertory of Princeton, if I remember rightly, in a review of Mr. Balfour's works, confidently asserted that Lucian, who lived about A. D. 160, always uses ψυχη to mean the soul or spiritual part of man, and that it never is found in his writings in the sense of "life."

In reading some of Lucian's Dialogues some time since, I came upon the following passage. One of the ghosts or shades, as he approaches the ferry of Charon, is heard uttering great lamentations, when Mercury asks him why he makes such an uproar, especially since on earth he was a philosopher; to which the ghost replies, "Because, O Mercury, I thought my life immortal," αθανατον την ψυχην. It is obvious that the word here is used to signify natural life on earth, because it is the soul or ghost which speaks. The example shows that Lucian does not *always* employ ψυχη to represent the spiritual part of man. Dial. Charon and Mercury.

I will add another example from Plato which is taken from Priestley's Repository, iv. p. 91. "Nothing could be excellent without intelligence, nor intelligent without a soul; for this reason God gave a *mind to the soul* and a soul to the body," νουν μεν δε ψυχη, ψυχην δε εν σωματι συνιστας. It is plain that Plato did not use ψυχη here to mean the mind or intelligent soul, for this he expresses by the word νους, which he makes as distinct from the ψυχη as he does the ψυχη from the σωμα or body. The translation, "nothing intelligent without a soul," is not sufficiently literal. It does not, I think, convey the idea of the original, which is

Digitized by Google

νουν δε αυ χωρις ψυχης, αδυνατον παραγενεσθαι τω. This would be better rendered, "It would not be possible for the mind to be, or act, without the life;" i. e., it could not perform its duties as part of the man or human being, without the life. Hence, he says, God associated it with the life, and the life with the body, and so made a complete active whole.

This passage reminds us of Paul's language to the Thessalonians, 1 Epist. v. 23: "I pray God your whole spirit, and soul, and body, be preserved blameless unto the coming of our Lord Jesus Christ." Paul uses πνευμα where Plato employs νους; and in this case seems to intimate or affirm the same distinction between the ψυχη and the spiritual part of man.

Aristotle has a curious use of the words in his Metaphysics, ii. c. 1. "As the eye turns toward the light, so the mind (ψυχης ὁ νους) turns toward what is most brilliant in nature." Grotius translates the phrase into Latin by the words "animi nostri mens." De Veritate ii. 18. *Note* 2. I am not ignorant of the doctrines of some of the ancient philosophical schools respecting the nature of man, or of the thinking part of him; but it was thought these passages might be useful, and help to distinguish the various shades of meaning which these words bear in the New Testament and elsewhere. Paul in his Epistle to the Ephesians (iv. 23,) has the phrase, τῶ πνεύματι νοος — "be renewed in the spirit of your mind." Of course πνευμα is used here in a tropical or figurative sense. Paul joins πνευμα and νους together, and Aristotle νους and ψυχη. Does the latter mean by the phrase given above, "the intelligence of the soul?" i. e., that portion of the soul or ψυχη which is intelligent or thinks. The ψυχη, or *soul*, seems to be a connecting link between the mind or spirit and the body, partaking of the properties of each, and so constituting the only line or medium of conjunction or mutual action between them—like the acid of a magneto-electric machine, by which the zinc and copper are brought into communication, and the electric current established.

T. B. T.

Digitized by Google

Art. XXI.

1. "*If a Man die, shall he live again?*"

Written on seeing an insect cross my path, October 20, after hearing it asserted, "Death is the end of man."

Poor little insect! born some vernal day,
And nursed amid the Summer's golden glow,
Now creeping forth to seek the latest ray
Of Autumn's sun, descending pale and low.

My heart is pained, poor insect, for thy fate;
A boding thought my pensive bosom fills;
For Autumn's days are wearing cold and late, —
I see sad presage o'er the gloomy hills.

I see the tempest gathering in the sky;
The genius of the storm is wailing loud;
And all that I can hope, is, — Thou shalt die,
And snows enwrap thee in their fleecy shroud.

Then may the tempest rack the wintry sky,
And fiercer blasts come roaring still behind,
But thou in sweet, unconscious sleep shalt lie,
Nor hear the storm, nor feel the piercing wind.

And is thy little being thus to end,
Thy fragile form forever past away?
No! for almighty power shall thee defend,
And thou awake to see a brighter day.

Yet long and wintry nights must intervene,
And cold and tardy pass the lonely hours;
But Spring will come again, with smile serene,
And call to life the tender budding flowers.

Then thy poor form, that slumbers there below,
Shall feel again life's renovating powers,
And, rising with the Spring's congenial glow,
Shall live again among the blooming flowers;

Not a poor insect, creeping on the ground,
(And poison in thy folds, 't is said, they trace,)
But pure as heaven's own breezes floating round,
And winged more beauteous than the feathered race.

Shall life, so sweet, revisit thee, poor worm,
And plume a puny insect's wing to rise, —
And O, shall man, who bears his Maker's form,
Ne'er wake again, to see the smiling skies? J. G. H.

Digitized by Google

2. *The Saviour's Prayer.*

All men have prayed. The hardest heart that beats
In human bosom, hath at times poured forth,
Perhaps unconsciously, the deep-wrung prayer;
And He who sees the secrets of all hearts,
Who hears the lowliest prayers that rise from earth
And all her shrines, hath heard the heart's appeal.
The criminal hath prayed; he who hath dipped
His hands in human blood, and on whose brow
The mark of Cain is set, even he hath prayed.
And the lone penitent hath bowed the knee,
And with an humble heart hath raised a prayer,
For mercy and forgiveness, unto Heaven.
And the sad wanderer in a foreign land
Gazes, at night, on other stars than those
Which blessed his boyhood's eyes, — hears other sounds
Than those of home, yet feels within his heart
That the same God is over all; and there,
Upon the soil his kindred never pressed,
He prays for blessings on that far-off home;
And from the couch of anguish and of pain,
And from the homes of sorrow and of death,
And from the hut of poverty and want,
Deep prayers go up to Heaven for strength and peace,
For meek submission to his will, for aid
Against temptation's power.
These are the prayers
That, from earth's many altars, rise to Heaven.
But O, there is a prayer, that once was breathed
'Mid death, and shame, and cursings, by the side
Of criminals, and with a nation's hate
Upon the sufferer. Like an angel's voice,
From the dark cross, arose that prayer, "O, Father,
Forgive them, for they know not what they do!"
And so our Saviour prayed, not for himself,
(He had found strength within the garden's shade,)
But the last words he uttered in his wo
Were for his murderers; and with that prayer
He bowed his head, and died!
Not so we pray.
Father, we come to thee for our own wants;
With lips that oft have murmured at thy will —
We raise to thee our eyes, which have too long
Been turned to earth; we lay upon thy shrine
The heart which has so often strayed from thee.
This, Father, thou hast seen, and thou hast heard.
And we have prayed to thee in thankfulness;
And, for the many comforts round our path,

Digitized by Google

Have called thee good and kind, and blessed thy name.
But O, how seldom do we come to thee
With thy Son's holy and forgiving prayer!
We say, Bless thou our friends; but we forget
To say, Forgive our enemies, O God!
We thank thee for the blessings round our path,
But do not ask thee to bestow the same
Upon our enemies.
He prayed not thus;
O, may we learn of him, and when we come
To thee with our petitions, may we say,
With the blessed spirit of thy Son, "O Father
Forgive them, for they know not what they do!" N. T. M.

Art. XXII.

Literary Notices.

1. The Life of Martin Luther. Gathered from his own writings. By M. Michelet, author of "The History of France," "The People," etc. Translated by G. H. Smith, F. G. S., Translator of "Michelet's History of France," etc. New York: D. Appleton & Co., 200 Broadway, &c., &c. 1846. 12mo. pp. 314.

The distinction between this and former Lives of Luther, cannot be described better than in Michelet's own words:

"Hitherto all that has been shown of Luther, is his battle with Rome. We give his whole life, his struggles, doubts, temptations, consolations; a picture in which the man engrosses as much as, and more than, the partisan. We show this violent and terrible reformer of the North, not only in his eagle's nest at Wartbourg, or braving the emperor and the empire in the Diet at Worms, but in his house at Wittemberg, in the midst of his grave friends, of his children, who cluster round his table, walking with him in his garden, by the border of the small pond, in that melancholy cloister which became a family residence: here we hear him dreaming aloud, and finding in all surrounding objects, the flowers, the fruit, the bird that flits by, food for grave and pious thoughts." — "The following work is neither the Life of Luther turned into an historical romance, nor a history of the establishment of Lutheranism; but a biography, consisting of a series of transcripts from Luther's own revelations. With the exception of the events of the earlier years of his life, when Luther could not have been the penman, the transcriber has seldom had occasion to hold the pen himself. His task has been limited to selecting, arranging, and fixing

Digitized by Google

the chronology of detached passages. Throughout the work Luther is his own spokesman — Luther's life is told by Luther himself.' *Introduction, ix. xi.*

We scarcely need say to those who are acquainted with M. Michelet's writings, that these promises are well fulfilled in the execution. He has contrived to place Luther himself before us, instead of giving us a mere description of him. We see the reformer and the man acting and living, — in all his simplicity, truthfulness, deep-working energies, courage, love, boisterous vehemence, and even vulgarity; no trait of character but is presented in full operation. There are many passages in his life which we should like to extract; but we prefer to occupy the space here allowed us, with the gloomy and disappointed feelings that embittered his latter days, when he saw the disorder and indifference which followed the ecclesiastical reform he had brought about. It is melancholy to contemplate the scene; but it teaches us what we must generally expect as one of the indirect and temporary consequences of breaking down any system of authority to which men have been long accustomed, even though a better be at the same time introduced.

"*To Spalatin.* 'I must say, that in all my life, and all my cares about the Gospel, I have never gone through so troubled a year as that which has just ended. I have a tremendous quarrel on hand with the lawyers on the subject of private marriages; in those whom I had believed to be steadfast friends of the Gospel, I find cruel enemies. Dost thou think that this is no pain to me, dear Spalatin?' (Jan. 30th, 1544.) 'I am idle, worn out, cold; that is to say, old and useless. I have finished my journey; it only remains for the Lord to gather me to my fathers, and to render unto corruption and the worms their share in me. I am satiated with life, if this be life. Pray for me, that my last moments may be salutary to myself and acceptable unto God. My only thoughts about the emperor and the empire are commending them to God in my prayers. The world seems to have arrived at its last hours, and, to use the psalmist's expression, to have grown old like a garment; and now is the time come that we must change it.' (Dec. 5th, 1544.) 'Had I known at the beginning what enemies men are to God's word, I should indisputably have been silent, and held my peace. I imagined they only sinned through ignorance.'

"He once said, 'Nobles, citizens, peasants, I might add almost all men, think they know the Gospel better than Dr. Luther or St. Paul himself; and look down on pastors, rather on the Lord and Master of pastors. . . . The nobles seek to govern, and yet know not how. The pope knows how to govern, and does govern. The least papist is more capable of governing than—I cry them mercy—ten of our court nobles.' Luther was one day told that there were six hundred rich cures vacant in the bishopric of Wurtzburg. 'No good will come of this,' he said; 'it will be the same with us if we go on despising God's word and his servants. If I desired to become rich, all I should have

Digitized by Google

to do would be not to preach. . . . The ecclesiastical visitors asked the peasants wherefore they would not support their pastors, when they kept cowherds and swineherds? 'Oh!' they said, 'we want these; we cannot do without them.' They thought they could do without pastors.'

"For six months Luther preached in his house to his own family every Sunday, but not in the church. 'I do this,' he said to Dr. Jonas, 'to clear my conscience, and discharge my duty as the father of a family. But I know and see that God's word will not be more minded here than in church.' 'You will have to succeed me as preacher, Dr. Jonas; think on it, and acquit yourself well.' He walked out of church one day, in anger at the people's talking. (A. D. 1545.) . . .

"Luther often said that it would be a great disgrace to the pope were he to die in his bed. 'All of you, thou pope, thou devil, ye kings, princes, and lords, are Luther's enemies, and yet you can do him no harm. It was not thus with John Huss. I take it that there has not been a man so hated as I for these hundred years. I, too, hate the world. In the whole round of life, there is nothing which gives me pleasure; I am sick of living. May our Lord then come quickly, and take me with him. May he, above all, come with his day of judgment. I would stretch forth my neck . . . so that he hurled his thunderbolt and I were at rest. . . .' He proceeds to console himself for the ingratitude of the world, by reflecting on the fates of Moses, Samuel, St. Paul, and of Christ. A guest of his said, that if the world were to last fifty years, many things might yet turn up. 'God forbid,' exclaimed Luther, 'it would be worse than all the past. There would arise many other sects, which are now hidden within the hearts of men. May the Lord come, and cut all this short, for there is no hope of improvement!' 'Life will be such a burthen, that there will be one universal cry from all the corners of the earth. 'Good God! come with the day of judgment!' And, happening to have in his hand a chaplet of white agates, he added, 'God grant that day may soon come. I would eat this chaplet to have it be to-morrow.'

"Speaking at his table of eclipses, and the little influence they appeared to have on the death of kings and other great people, the doctor replied, 'You are right; eclipses no longer produce any sensible effects; and I think myself that our Saviour will come soon to veritable effects; and that ere long the judgment will put an end to all our cogitations, and all things else. I dreamt it was so the other day while I lay asleep in the afternoon, and I said then *in pace in id ipsum requiescam seu dormiam.* The day of judgment must soon come; for that the papal Church should reform is an impossibility, neither will the Turks and Jews. . . . In fact, there is no real improvement in the state of the empire; and see, for thirty years now have they assembled diets without deciding on anything. . . . I often think when ruminating in my walks of what I ought to ask in my prayers for the diet. The bishop of Mentz is naught; the pope is lost for ever. I see nothing else to be done but to say, 'Lord, thy kingdom come!' . .

"'I have not much time, my dear Probst, to write, for I am overcome by fatigue and old age: *alt, kalt, ungestalt* (old, cold, mouldy), as they say. Nevertheless, rest I cannot have, beset as I am by so many reasons and obligations to write. I know more than you can of the fatal-

Digitized by Google

ities that await this age. The world is threatened with ruin! it is inevitable; the more the devil is allowed to roam, the more brutish the world becomes, There is but one consolation left us; it is that this day is nigh. The world has been sated with God's word, and taken a strange antipathy to it. Fewer false prophets arise. Why raise up new heresies when there is an epicurean disdain of the world? Germany is dead; she will never again be what she has been. The nobles only think of extorting; the towns think but of themselves (and with reason): so that the kingdom is divided against itself, just when it ought to be confronting the legion of unchained devils which compose the Turkish army. We seem to care little if God be for or against us, and think we shall triumph by our own strength over Turks, the devils, God, and everything: such are the overweening confidence and stupid security of expiring Germany! And we, what can we do in the matter? Complaints and tears are equally fruitless. All that is left for us to do is to reiterate the prayer, 'Thy will be done!' (March 26th, 1542.) 'I see, in every one, an indomitable cupidity, which to me seems one sign of the approach of the last day. It is as if the world in its old age and at its last gasp, became delirious; as so often happens with the dying.' (March 8th, 1544.) 'I do believe that I am that great trumpet which prefaces and announces the coming of our Lord. Therefore, weak and failing as I may be, and small as may be the sound that I can make this world hear, my voice rings in the ears of the angels in heaven, who will take up the strain after us and complete the solemn call! Amen, and Amen.' (August 6th, 1545.) pp. 236–240."

After what we have said, it is superfluous to commend this work to those of our readers who would get a familiar idea of Luther. For this purpose, it takes precedence of every biography and historical account we have seen of the reform.

2. Typee: A Peep at Polynesian Life, during a Four Months' Residence in a Valley of the Marquesas. With Notices of the French Occupation of Tahiti and the Provisional Cession of the Sandwich Islands to Lord Paulet. By Herman Melville. New York: Wiley & Putnam, &c., &c. 1846. 12mo. pp. 325.

We have found this book very interesting; and it would be very instructive, to us at least, laying open as it does the scenes of these far-off and almost unknown isles of the Pacific, were there not apparently a strong coloring of the romantic thrown over the descriptions, and an evident attempt at effect in the management of the narrative. We know not precisely what is to be relied upon as simple matter of fact, and what is to be set down to the account of imaginative recollection. Be this as it may, the pictures it presents, both of natural scenery, and of the voluptuous life of the natives, are vivid, and seem to bring the objects before our eyes.

The author's opinion of the results of the missionary labors on the character and condition of the Pacific islanders, is unfavor-

Digitized by Google

able; but here, again, we do not know by what standard of moral and social excellence he judges. In reading his work, we were at times led to suspect that the voluptuousness, which reigned in the valley of Typee, had somewhat affected his own taste; and if so, he would be apt to regard as evils many of those changes introduced by the missionaries, which would appear to others as improvements. Indeed, we must not look for unmixed advantages in any state of social progress. It seems a law of our nature, that every general improvement of this kind which is made, will be attended with some corresponding disadvantages. In passing from a life of mere animal pleasure to one of intellectual and moral enjoyment, it is perhaps impossible to retain the former in its perfection, at the same time that we secure the latter; and in judging of the results of the enterprise, great care ought to be taken not to fix on the partial inconveniences, and even downright evils, to the exclusion of the general good with which they are naturally connected.

3. Twenty-four years in the Argentine Republic; embracing its Civil and Military History, and an account of its Political Condition before and during the Administration of Governor Rosas; his Course of Policy; the Causes and Character of his Interference with the Government of Montevideo, &c., &c. By Col. J. Anthony King, an officer in the Army of the Republic, and twenty-four years a President of the Country. New York: D. Appleton & Company, 200 Broadway, &c., &c. 1846. 8vo. pp. 324.

4. Rosas. (Art. in Democratic Review for May, 1846.)

It is now thirty years since the province, or vice-royalty of Buenos Ayres, struck the first blow for liberty, and set about the work of establishing a separate national organization, under the name of the "United States of South America." And what has been the history of that country during this long period? How does it compare with that of the "United States of North America?" The contrast cannot be described by the patriot, the philanthropist, or the friend of human progress in all departments, political, social, religious, without a feeling of intense sorrow, without a momentary half-abandonment of hope and faith in his race.

The book and the article, the titles of which we have given above, though written with directly opposite aims, are both compelled to furnish ample proof of this. The condition of the Argentine Republic during the period named, and at the present hour, presents a picture that might make angels weep. If the record of Col. King is to be received with an abatement of only one half, it is still frightful enough to show how thoroughly the country has been cursed by the ambition and foul passions of

Digitized by Google

those who pretend to be the friends of liberty and man. Even the writer in the Democratic Review, whose sole object is to glorify Rosas, is forced to acknowledge that, for one who has "no ambition," he has done some deeds of blood, that might make a demon shudder; while the author of the book shows, by statements which he says can be abundantly substantiated by living witnesses, that this Rosas is one of the most cool and systematic tyrants, one of the most wholesale murderers, that ever disgraced any age or country. As we have said, the writers have directly opposite purposes in view, one to make him the purest of patriots, the other the most abominable of tyrants; and as in all such cases, the truth probably lies between.

Our limits will not allow us to enter into this matter, nor indeed to set forth at length, as we should wish, the political and social condition of the people of the Argentine. But we would advise our readers to peruse the book of Colonel King, who, for twenty-four years, has been in the midst of the scenes he describes, "all of which he saw, and part of which he was." One thing is certain; the reader cannot go through with the perusal, without a feeling of thankfulness that his lot is cast in the "United States of *North* America;" and a feeling of pride that he belongs to the Anglo Saxon race. Let him look at the condition of Mexico, Central America, and every one of the Republics of South America; and then turn to his own country, her government, the stability which marks it, the absence of revolutions and civil wars; let him consider the moral and social and religious state of the people; let him survey the wide-spread commerce and manufactures, the rapidly increasing wealth and power of the country, and the influence shed abroad among the nations in behalf of *the people*, — let all this be taken into the comparison, and he will feel that God has verily laid his hand upon us in blessing. At all events, the book in question, and information from other sources, have impressed upon us, more deeply than ever, the fact, that the only experiment on the capabilities of the people for self-government which has made any approximation towards success, is our own. And, more and more every day, we see how much is yet to be done to make this success permanent. May Heaven grant that what is wanting, may be filled up speedily.

Digitized by Google

Art. XXIII.

The Ronge Reform.

John Ronge, the Holy Coat of Treves, and the New German-Catholic Church, &c. New York: Harper & Brothers, &c., 1845. 12mo. pp. 172.

The recent Religious Reform in Germany is of the deepest importance to the Christian world. Springing up in the same section of the earth wherein Luther began the reform of the sixteenth century — occupying a like position and combating like errors, this reform of eighteen hundred forty-four should be hailed with joy by every lover of religious truth. Our denomination, at least, while making professions of love for open inquiry and the widest toleration, should neither be blind to the progress, nor indifferent to the success, of this new movement. What is this movement? who are the actors in it? and to what end have they labored? are the first suggestions that come to us. Luther's movement was founded on a denial of the sacredness of the universal Roman Church, especially the sale and abuse of indulgences, by the purchase of which, a man might buy for money a full pardon for all sins; Luther himself was the first and greatest actor in that struggle, and finally a radical reform of faith and life become the aim of all his efforts. The present movement is a protest against some of the practices of the Romish Church in Germany. John Ronge, a Catholic priest, of Breslau, in Silesia, is the chief actor in the work; and that work itself is a struggle for the redemption and restoration of a prostrate people from beneath the pressure of Papal power. And well may we judge these to be men and matters of some importance to the world. The causes that have led, one by one, to the full development of this movement, should be sought in the local history of religious affairs in Germany for the last two years.

I. The subject opens here. On the 6th July, 1844, it was publicly announced, in the city of Treves, that the same *seamless coat*, which the Saviour wore from the hall of judgment to the cross of Calvary, was to be exhibited

Digitized by Google

to the people. This announcement was made by bishop Arnoldi of that city, and the exhibition was to begin on the 18th August. On that day, a coat was exhibited, and, as announced, it was daily exposed to the inspection of the people, for the succeeding six weeks, as the actual coat worn by the Lord Jesus when in the flesh. So extensively had the intelligence extended, so excited had the public mind become on the subject, that the attendance, as may be supposed, was immense. The whole affair had received the solemn sanction of Arnoldi, and, within that period of six weeks, one million five hundred thousand of the peasantry of Germany came to see the "Holy Coat" of Treves. Money, as a matter of course, was received, if not as pay, as a gift, and on all sides and by every mode of conveyance, crowds and throngs pressed on, to see the revered relic, to leave the trifle of their tribute, and to obtain there some purifying or preserving power. Those were days of glory for Rome. Every body was there. The Moselle, which flows through the city, was covered with steamers freighted to the full with a living mass; the great thoroughfares into Treves were filled with a moving multitude, all hastening eagerly on, all anxious to attain the same end. The rich came in chariots or in boats of pleasure, with bands of music and songs of joy; the middle classes pressed forward in their own conveyances; and the poor, of all ages and sexes and conditions in life, urged on their way with such means as God and nature had given them. Many sold their substance to get the means to go, others undertook the journey without means; and the natural consequence was, that want and starvation and crime often attended their steps. Yet this sad scene began with every demonstration of joy. A college of cardinals was in attendance; splendid sermons were delivered on the occasion; and the opening of the doors of the cathedral was announced by the ringing of bells and the firing of cannon. Such was the splendor of the pageantry that suddenly aroused every mind, and filled all Europe with mingled emotions of astonishment and shame.

But while this tide of wild enthusiasm was still rolling on — while pilgrim-feet yet pressed the courts of the cathedral, and idolatrous eyes were gazing on the garment at Treves, grief and indignation were deeply moving the

Digitized by Google

heart of an obscure priest of the Catholic Church in Breslau of Silesia,—John Ronge. Already had he raised his voice against the extravagancies of Papal power, and, in consequence, he had been suspended from the priestly office. Still, friends and parishioners clung to him in adversity; his own soul was still devoted to truth and the religious rights of Germany. From Laurahütte, the place of his retreat, he sent forth his opinion of the holy coat, in a published letter, addressed to Arnoldi; and from the immense influence it is allowed to have exerted on the direction of subsequent affairs, we must present here some of its passages. After naming the particulars that followed the exhibition of the holy coat — the gathering, the crowd, the greedy gain of the priests, the crime and corruption of the people, — he adds these words to the mover of this measure: —

"Arnoldi, Bishop of Treves, I therefore turn to you, and demand, by authority of my office and calling as a priest and teacher of the German people — in the name of Christendom, in the name of the German nation, and in the name of its instructers, — that you put an end to the unchristian spectacle of the exhibition of the holy tunic, and withdraw this garment, that the offence which has been given may not be still increased! For do you not know — as bishop you ought to know — that the founder of the Christian religion left to his disciples and followers, not his coat, but his spirit? His coat, Bishop Arnoldi of Treves, belongs to his *executioners*. Do you not know, — as bishop you ought to know — that Jesus taught, 'God is a spirit, and they that worship him must worship him in spirit and in truth?' and He may be worshiped every where, not only in the temple at Jerusalem, on mount Gerizim, or at Treves in the presence of the holy tunic. Hark ye! Bishop of Arnoldi of Treves, you know all this, and better probably than I can tell you. Do not allow yourself to be deceived by the influx of thousands of the German people, or thousands upon thousands, but believe me, that while hundreds of thousands may hasten with holy fervor to Treves, — millions, like myself, are filled with horror and the deepest indignation by the disgraceful spectacle. And this indignation prevails not in individual ranks and parties, but among all classes — even in the Catholic priesthood." And then with prophetic voice, he concludes, — "Judgment will overtake you sooner than you think. Arnoldi! the historian is already seizing his pen, to submit your name to the contempt of your contemporaries and of posterity, and to stigmatize you as the Tetzel of the nineteenth century."

Digitized by Google

Such are some of the features in the letter of Ronge to the bishop who exhibited the holy coat. Brief, pungent, powerful, like Bonaparte's battle speeches, it fell like hot shot into the camp of the Catholics. Appearing in Silesia a remote section of Eastern Germany, and addressed to a bishop in the West, it cast its illumination upon the whole of its course, and wherever the German language was spoken, it turned all eyes upon its author as a fit leader in a great reform. Subsequent events show him worthy of the station. But his review of the character of Arnoldi, and his exposure of the exhibition at Treves, could not be allowed to pass without an effort at rebuke; and, before the echo of applause had died away, came the storm of papal war upon him. A shower of pamphlets appeared; every charge, that could be invented against his life or labors, was circulated by an enraged priesthood; and a great clamor was raised against him. Still, he stood firm, and proceeded, in a composed spirit, to write his Justification.

II. And here opens a new scene in our subject. In the preceding sketch of this movement, we have seen some of the deeds of its chief actor; but he now stands forth for a separate view. His justification calls us to consider the leading events in his life. According to his own account, John Ronge was born October 16th, 1813, at Bischofswald, district of Neisse, and a principality of Prussia. Until the twelfth year of his life, he was a keeper of sheep. His occupation tended to develope early a poetic temperament, and form his young mind to sincere and sublime thoughts. His fondness for reading was commenced and cherished over the pages of the Scriptures. Over them he loved to linger, while reclining on the slopes of the mountains or under the shades of the forest; and precious to him were the glowing pictures he found there, of pastoral innocence and pastoral life. The church had taught him some, and he was the more anxious to live and learn of her. He hence sought entrance to her institutions of learning. At the age of fourteen he became a pupil in the Grammar School of Neisse, where he continued to pursue his studies for the term of ten years. Thence, at the age of twenty-four, he entered the College of Breslau. This was in 1837. In both these institutions he was of quiet habits, and diligent in all the duties of a student's life. But in neither

Digitized by Google

was he of that class of gentle geniuses, who glide on in the paths of learning with a mechanical movement. Ronge was full of thought, and ardent in its expression. Rotteck, the historian, was his favorite study; and his broad views of man, and his eulogies of liberty, sank deeply into the soul of our young pupil. His spirit glowed with a generous enthusiasm for the great interests of men and nations, that gave coloring and character to the whole picture of his college life.

In 1839 he entered the Ecclesiastical Seminary at Breslau. Hither he came to complete that preparation for the pulpit, which had ever been before him as the object of all his efforts. But he came to be disappointed. He had fondly trusted that here he should find a study for the mind and a school for the heart. How sad the mistake! Instead of fit teachers, who should guide him into all the great duties of his office, he found only tyrants for teachers, and hypocrites standing in the place of holy men. And the most worthy work of theirs, was to rob the pupil of every principle of honor, or confidence, or trust, and to make him a hypocrite within, and a sycophant without. Ronge exchanged delight for despair. His ministry demanded the surrender of his manhood. A struggle began. He had hoped and trusted that his was a high calling — he had looked to it as furnishing a broad field for usefulness to others and honor to himself. It was a fond, foolish dream. The church had its own ends ever in view, and they who had a part in her ministry, must be partakers of her work. And for the attainment of those qualifications, the candidate must learn who was his master, and what his duty. Ronge was obliged to yield. With many murmurs, but with the confident belief that the future would furnish what the present denied, he submitted to the degrading discipline of the Seminary in peace.

Near the close of 1840 he left his studies, and became curate of Grottkau. His position was one of danger. The Catholic ministry, unrivalled by any in the world for its knowledge of human nature and its insight into men and motives, had seen in him an unbroken spirit, and the day he went to his duties, a mark was placed upon him. His acts were studied, his motives measured; and by the means of spies and informers, a constant control was kept

Digitized by Google

over him. The burden was too oppressive to be borne. He turned from the pulpit to the school; and there, where the enemy could not come, he sought to sow in young minds, those seeds which had taken such vigorous root in his own. It was in this retreat, that he wrote his "Catholic Songs," so full of the wailings of a troubled spirit, and so fervent with indignation against the oppressions of the church. His poetry was only the truth of his experience.

When he had once begun to utter his thoughts, there was occasion enough for him to continue to speak. Dr. Ritter, of the cathedral church of Breslau, presided as bishop there, during a vacancy of that office. He was a man of easy integrity, generous to his favorites, and implacable to all those of independent minds. The Chapter at length united in the choice of Dr. Knauer, as regular successor to that station. The election was one of auspicious promise. But a year passed away, and the choice was not confirmed, — the bishop had not taken his seat. Dr. Ritter, it was feared, had caused the delay, that he might enjoy for a brief season longer, the pleasure of religious power. The people began to murmur, and soon an essay entitled, "Rome and the Cathedral Church of Breslau," appeared in the papers. It was writen by "A Curate." Ritter at once suspected Ronge of being its author, and demanded of him a confession of the fact without delay. He replied on his conscience, that he was not at liberty either to affirm or deny. Then another step was taken; without judge or jury, he was suspended from the office of his cure, and ordered to appear at the Seminary of Breslau and receive his sentence. Other charges were brought against him. He was not only a priest of a bold spirit, but a man of bad manners. His countenance was not sufficiently solemn; he did not roll his eyes imploringly toward heaven when in the pulpit; and, what was the worst of all, like many a perverse young priest of this generation, his coat was too short and his hair too long — to the sorrow and scandal of more sober seniors! It was too much, and the offending individual had to plead guilty to some of the charges.

This was the time that Bishop Knauer came into office. Ronge appeared before him without delay, confessed himself the author of the offensive article, stated his motives

Digitized by Google

frankly, and asked to be restored to his office and duties. The promise was as frankly given him. But the poor bishop soon found that he must not offend the men of power, and so Ronge was formally dismissed from his office as a curate of the German people, and both priests and people were warned against him. He had to leave Grottkau. With honorable testimonials of character from the municipality of the place, and with the love of churchmen, citizens and children, he took his departure. It was at Laurahütte, in Upper Silesia, that he found a home. But the times called for the man,—the man was ready for the times. From this retreat, he hurled that bolt upon Arnoldi of Treves; and when the mingled shouts of rage and revenge had died around him, he wrote from the same station, his Justification.

As we have now seen, it embraced the prominent features of his early life, the circumstances that led him into the ministry, the iron system of his education in the Seminary, the anguish of his mind as he became more sensible of the degradation of the priesthood, and finally the full conviction that duty called him to the work of placing himself against the church. All this is told with an air of sober sincerity that speaks for its truth. This was the severing stroke. Henceforth he felt that he had written too freely to be forgiven; and the day his Justification appeared in print, he was aware that he must stand or fall alone. When the hour of excommunication came, it found him impatient for the separation. He saw, too, that the same spirit which had caused him to offend, had found its way into other hearts. The whole of Germany had caught the infection. A voice of sympathy came up to him from every quarter of his own father-land, for which he had suffered and struggled so bravely. From Weimar, and Westphalia, and West Prussia, and Ulm, and Dantzic, addresses came in upon him, and he was encouraged to stand up and lead on in the exposure and reform of the abuses of the Catholic church.

III. Let us now proceed, and point out to what end the reformers have labored. The object sought, was to purify the church, to build it only on the truth of God and his revealed word. To attain this end, became now the aim of the devoted Ronge. The lessons of his own brief

Digitized by Google

experience had confirmed him in the opinion, that no hope of reform could come from the Church of Rome, — it was wedded to its idols and he must leave it alone. Other sympathy must be sought, other hearts and hands must be brought to the work. Hence he turned to the people and to the inferior clergy. In an address to them, in which he set forth the oppressions endured by both of these classes, he first declared in favor of a separate church organization, to be known and called, *The German Catholic Church.* In the Address he says,

"We must first of all sweep these abuses away; we must dismiss, as unintelligible to our people, from all the houses of God in Germany, the *Latin language*, that monument of our subservience and spiritual bondage, that unholy restraint which outrages the clearest injunctions of the gospel, that forbid the use of an unknown tongue. We must abolish the *Confessional*, that moral torture-chamber, — that degrading tribunal of inquisition, which stamps men hypocrites and blinded slaves to priestcraft — and which, without a warrant from the gospel, was first introduced by one of the most power-loving Popes twelve hundred years after Jesus Christ. We must abolish all those mischievous contrivances of Rome, which are intended only for the extortion of money — which undermine true piety and degrade the priest to a farmer and trafficker of salvation. And the pure and true Catholic, Christian religion, shall alone remain, and its fundamental law — *the law of love*, — shall not only be expressed in words, but practically evidenced in all our dealings with all our fellow-men of every faith and creed."

In all this, there was a great advance, — casting off an old, dead language, the confession of sins to mortal men, and recognizing love as the great law of intercourse and of action between every member of the universal brotherhood. It may be a common custom with the great body of Christians, to teach the doctrines of Christ in a living language, to denounce the confessional and all the cunning craftiness of the Popish priesthood. But to declare that *the law of love* should be the only law of all practical life, is something almost new under the sun. It is a law that has been suffered to occupy but a small space in the church on earth; and as to its practical power among the Christian fraternity, thousands on thousands in the Israel of our God have died without the sight. Now it comes forth to the scattered remnant of the redeemed in a voice from the bosom of the

Digitized by Google

Catholic church. And it was not put forth in vain. From appearing in addresses, these views of God and duty were proclaimed in the pulpits, and ministers devoted themselves to the work of teaching them to the people.

And the people heard them gladly. Priests renounced Rome, and ranged themselves under the banner of reform; the Pope was rejected, and truth and love became the great themes of the pulpit. And while the new reform was gathering strength and support from all classes and every section of the land, it became the conviction of many of the brethren that some measures might safely be taken to promote unity of views and harmony of action. Hence a Council convened at Leipzig, and a brief Confession was adopted as the expression of faith and the basis of subsequent organization.

From its articles, the following are selected as the most essential: "The foundation of Christian faith shall be sought by us solely and exclusively in the Holy Scriptures, the understanding and expounding of which is the province of reason, thoroughly imbued and affected with Christian principle." This is the position of the Protestant Reformation, and on its strength, Protestants have relied through the religious conflicts and commotions of three centuries. Once more from the Confession: "With reference to the objective principles of belief, it is held, that there ought to be no impediment to free inquiry, and that no one shall be anathematized on account of exercising the right conceded to him, of free inquiry; because it is impossible to fix a completely definite rule of faith for the human mind." This is the second grand position, taken. And if the first was the soul of Protestantism, this is the spirit and life of liberal Christianity. It allows free inquiry; it admits the impossibility of forming a complete creed, and it willingly trusts the human mind to search for the great treasures of truth for itself, without any earthly guide. In substance, it may be briefly said, the Confession farther rejects the Pope, abolishes auricular confession, allows the marriage of the clergy, makes use of the language of the people in all religious services, condemns the invocation of images, relics or saints, as leading to most gross abuses; forbids the observances of pilgrimages or fastings, discards all indulgences, and finally leaves the out-

Digitized by Google

ward form of public worship to adapt itself to the wants of time and place.

From this outline-view of the German Catholic Church, we may justly suppose that every thing is rejected that has tended in the Romish church to make religion a possession of the priests and not of the people. This is the people's church. It is the production of the people themselves, rising from oppression, and selecting the most rational and consistent means for the regulation of their religious affairs. Still, this is an imperfect church. And the same must be said of all others, whether they were originated by Henry VIII., or Martin Luther, or John Calvin, or John Wesley, or John Murray. Nor is the church of John Ronge to be condemned for having the same imperfect character. It must do its work; under its organization an intelligent ministry has been arrayed, and it has already begun its labors.

That ministry has had abundant success. Congregations of the new faith have been gathered in Breslau, Leipzig, Dresden, Berlin, Magdeburg, Brunswick, Worms, and Cologne. The visitations of Ronge, from place to place, are attended by thousands of people, and his preaching is everywhere productive of the warmest zeal and enthusiasm for the cause. The king of Saxony, though a Catholic, has avowed himself in favor of the new movement, and while others of the German principalities approve, the king of Prussia[1] will not, in all probability, very strenuously oppose it. Ronge has visited Switzerland, too, and the doctrines of his reform have been heard and approved in the land of Calvin and Zwingle. So much has been done. And every mail from the continent of Europe, brings welcome tidings of the continued progress and constant success of the new reform. The wants of religious man have demanded a closer and more immediate connection with the truths of the gospel. No longer can they be received through the aid of popes or priests; but from God's word they must come, and living and last-

[1] Every form of religion must have the sanction of law, before it can be tolerated in Prussia. Soon after the rise of the German Catholics, Frederic William IV. granted them the liberty of opinion and places for public worship. More recently, he has, by an order of state, suspended all legal process against them.

Digitized by Google

ing will be their sway over the labors and lives of a great people.

IV. It may be said, that the holy coat was not the cause, — it was only the occasion, of this reform. It is true, it gave the immediate impulse to the movement, but there were causes existing before and beyond the exhibition at Treves. They are found in the intolerant and oppressive character of the Catholic Church in Germany for the last quarter of a century. In fact, since the peace of Paris, it has been the policy of that church to rule the German States with a rigor, tempered only by revenge. So much was lost to the Catholic cause, during the campaigns of Napoleon, that the church has since resolved to redouble her cords and strengthen her stakes. And this has been done with a silence that has secured its success. Step by step, act by act, and atrocity upon atrocity, have done the work of bearing down the people under a most bitter, degrading bondage. The farce at Treves was only the last scene of the last act of the great religious drama. When it was passing over the stage, our chief actor had been, by the same despotism, driven from his work, though not defeated; cast down, yet not conquered.

The movement itself was momentary; but its causes came from remote sources, and reached back through all the riot and wrong of religious rulers for many years. Here is the chief hope we have of the profit and permanence of the work. No great things ever arise from the reformation of recent wrongs — from the evils and oppressions of to-day, to be rectified to-morrow. All the aspects of nature assure us, that the great events of the world spring from great sources. It is so in history. They who read its records, forcibly feel the fact, that time and toil have ever been essential to the growth of states and the greatness of the renowned empires of the past. And both nature and history embody the same principle, which we find in the development of truth and the destruction of error. Time is needed — trial is necessary, and tribulation is essential, to prepare the human soul to triumph. Such is the nature of man, that he has little care for the blessings that come to him without cost. It is only where blood and battle have been freely given for God and justice, that sacred shrines have been reared, and the earth

Digitized by Google

itself has become enriched with revolutionary dust. Such are the motives that have made Germany the field of fierce conflict, where conscience has spoken, and confusion has smitten and scattered the foes of truth. The might of the stroke came through its long delay, and the vigor of the hand that gave it was from the doubt and danger that attended the effort. In this reform, the movement began from the last act in a lengthened catalogue of corruption, cruelty and crime. It is another great lesson for the Church of Rome. And how terrible is its voice to the seven-hilled empress! All her affairs were at ease. The "Successor" of the apostles sent out his word of command, and his will was done by his minions, with the meekness of children who feared the frown of their father. But when the conflict came, the truth triumphed at once. The ease with which this was accomplished is a warning of destiny and doom to such as shall dare to stand between man and his Maker, for the time to come. Every effort, intended to enslave, only serves to alienate, and the hierarchy that has attempted the one, may confidently expect the other. The first is the cause,—the second is its concomitant effect. And in no event of religious history has the success of this principle been more complete, than in the Ronge reform. Springing up at a recent date, it has taken deep root among the millions of Germany, and acquired a power that must give it position and influence. The simplicity of its organization, the correctness of its doctrines, and the earnest enthusiasm of its advocates, are the sure indications of its full and final triumph over all its foes. For ourselves, we find in those doctrines a closer coincidence with our own, than can be found, perhaps, in any other religious communion. They occupy the same broad grounds, allow the like liberty, and its advocates and we are engaged in one work through one class of means. It is certainly true, that much of that form of religion we denominate liberal Christianity, is found in the ranks of the new reform.

G. W. G.

Digitized by Google

Art. XXIV.

Universalism the Demand of the Age.

All men love sympathy in their endeavors to promote truth. The solitude of a great mind, bearing testimony to a new revelation in the face of an unbelieving world, though full of grandeur, is gladly exchanged for the society of appreciating disciples. There is an instinctive propensity in all men to communicate. Like the Grecian sage, we would rush from the closet into the street, at the birth of every good thought, crying "Eureka! Eureka!" Never do we fully understand an opinion, until we hold it in common with others, and see it in the light thrown from their minds; for a great truth is capable of a myriad of original expressions. Varying with the nature of the souls it inhabits, the test of truth is that many minds arrive at it by paths widely differing. Great moral principles are the strongest bonds of human friendship, it being impossible that men should reach a certain degree of mental development without perceiving them. Whenever announced, we feel that every one around us should openly or unconsciously bear testimony to their excellence. There is, in this respect, a significance in our brotherhood, which has never yet been fully understood. We have yet to feel that complete mental and moral isolation is complete death; that God gives us truth, not as private property, but to communicate; and that only in the deepest sympathy with our brethren, is true individualism possible. From this feeling, active or latent in us all, arises the desire that others should acknowledge and practise the doctrines we teach.

And especially may we, as a denomination, be indulged in such a wish. We feel that one glorious element of Christianity has been given us to develope. We know how greatly the world has suffered in ages past through want of hearty faith in it. We believe, could it be truly felt and lived, it would be the universal remedy for all sin in individuals and communities. Shall we not, then, love to contemplate its progress over error, and hail every new

Digitized by Google

indication of its advancement, as we would survey with delight every fresh tint in the east, before the sunrise?

It is our purpose in this article, to notice one tendency of the age towards Universalism — the social. This may be less obvious to a superficial observer than others, yet we think, when closely examined, it will abound in decisive indications.

By Universalism, we understand the acknowledgment of Love as the highest principle in the moral universe. All our distinctive tenets are but the results of this divine law. God is love, therefore he created man for a noble destiny, making all labor, sorrow and retribution, disciplinary. So must the influences of his providence be adequate to the accomplishment of the end proposed. Love is the only moral power in the universe; therefore it must be sufficient to overcome all sin. It is the highest state of the soul, the only condition upon which its faculties can act harmoniously; therefore it must be the last result of all religious culture. A living faith in this principle, as means and end in the progressive training of man, entitles any one to our denominational name. We believe that society is tending to this centre of all true civilization; that literature is imbibing more of its spirit; and that the iron theology of the past age is slowly unclenching its grasp upon mankind, and losing its strength before this subduing power.

We are often ignorant of the progress of truth in the world, because we look only to palpable results. Especially is this true of religious ideas. We think creeds must disappear, churches fall asunder, and congregations disown the faith of their childhood, at the preaching of a truth long abused. But such is not the natural course of events. In this series of results, theological systems are the last to be surrendered. There are many different methods by which the power of the new doctrine must be indicated before it pass into the catechism and the church-ritual. A form of Christian belief often hangs around a community which is far in advance of it. Men do not hastily abandon their religious positions, but remain within them, making a show of opposition to the advancing enemy, while at heart they are traitors to the cause. As the snake lives in his old skin until a new covering is perfected, so communities lurk in their old religious forms until they can mature

Digitized by Google

opinions, and step forth thoroughly furnished. Thus we must look in other directions than to the church and the writings of professed theologians, to discover the first acknowledgment of new truth.

All progress in society is first indicated by the spontaneous action of men. "The preamble of thought, the transition through which it passes from the unconscious to the conscious, is action." We live great truths, before we believe them. The Creator has placed in every soul a longing for the right, an innate spirit of love and justice. This nature of ours is too strong for the creeds. No system of doctrine, however skilfully framed and authoritatively enforced, can long restrain the imprisoned spirit of good in our hearts. The first indication of apostasy is always the unconscious bursting forth of a natural sentiment in the face of conventionalism. Men are won by the pleading of the "Holy Spirit" to work things wholly inconsistent with their theology. Unconsciously they are loving those whom they believe to be under the curse of God. They cannot remember an insult or injury a year, though Deity glows with the bitter recollection forever. They slander the world, and their love for it, crushed and turned awry, breaks out in destructive bursts of passion, or paints upon their features the epitaph of withered affections and an abused nature. Men of narrow minds overcome the difficulty by separating life from religion, going in the spirit of God to their prayers, and in the spirit of the devil to their business; but reflecting men cannot live upon such absurdities. The waves of natural feeling daily break more fearfully against the trembling barriers of their creeds. Life gradually recedes from opinion, until the man is startled at "the great gulf fixed" between them, and begins to question his belief. Then comes the second stage of progress,—scepticism about sectarian essentials, struggles between reason and a conscience as yet afraid to trust itself in the protection of a new doctrine; then the final triumph and expression of thought in literature and conversation. But the truth must yet fight through a long day before the standards of the church begin to waver and the theologians throw down their arms. Action, individual and social, literature and theology, are the mile-stones upon the highway of a great religious idea.

Digitized by Google

Let us now endeavor to interpret "the signs of the times" in the first of these elements.

There is one feature in the social aspect of the times which cannot fail to impress every observer. We speak of the Reform Associations of the day. These are an anomaly in human society; and in the history of the present age, will be noted as one of its distinguishing characteristics. The reform spirit is not partial, or local in its operations. It fearlessly travels the round of existing institutions, and demands from each an "account of its stewardship." No custom is so formidably environed by wealth, aristocracy or religious prejudice, that it hears not the summons. Nothing can escape by reason of its insignificance. Popular theology, manners, legislation, education, even the very constitution of society, have all been fiercely interrogated. No one can have failed to observe the increase of associated effort, in this direction, for the last quarter of a century. There are now societies for the promotion of all private virtues, and the reformation of all public sins. We cannot regard this movement as the offspring of temporary enthusiasm. It is no Aurora kindling in the sky at midnight, to disappear and leave darkness more awful, but the shooting streaks of a new sunrise. It becomes him, therefore, who would study the tendencies of our age, to investigate this manifestation most attentively.

We are not to be understood as expressing sympathy with all the measures by which men have endeavored to advance these reforms. We know the strong tendency of earnest minds, by partial observation, to enlarge an idea to the destruction of all its true relations; and no one can be ignorant of the constant watchfulness required to hold men on the separating ground between zeal and uncharitableness. Few great ideas are long permitted to exist uninjured by imprudent and wicked advocacy. They originate in the spontaneous promptings of men in their better moments; but love too often grows cold in face of discouragement; and unholy passions rush in and defile the truth. The selfish, ambitious and vain come to shine in the light reflected from the new doctrine, and the true spirit shrinks from the crowd it has gathered around itself. Thus, we have aristocratic denouncers of slavery, bigoted defenders

Digitized by Google

of religious liberty, and even uncharitable preachers of Universalism! But these results are common to all ages, and to all attempts to promulgate truth. They are not peculiar to our system of modern reforms. Philosophy, science and Christianity have experienced them. Their consideration is therefore foreign to the present purpose, which is to ascertain the ideas upon which this new movement rests, the states of mind in which such labors were first conceived and entered upon.

The first principle involved in these attempts to regenerate the world, is faith in the native dignity of man, or belief in a certain innate goodness which sin can never expel from the soul, and by which it may always be renewed. This fact may not be acknowledged by all who advocate these reforms—but so it is. Why attempt to reform men, if incapable of reformation? Why seek to lead a soul into light, whose native element is darkness? Why form Temperance Societies, Peace Societies, Moral Reform Societies, with all their apparatus of committee, tract and newspaper, designed to reach every individual in a nation, to entreat to righteousness a creature naturally depraved? The absurdity is too apparent to require further illustration. No human being would engage in such a warfare as that of the reformer in 1846, unless a belief existed, at the bottom of his heart, that sinful men could be saved, and were worth saving. The virtual language of these endeavors is, "The Holy Spirit never ceases to strive. Native tendencies to virtue cannot be eradicated. In the soul of the most abandoned one will always linger some desire, some memory or hope, which can be quickened to a life that shall reanimate his dying spirit." Faith in the innate nobility of man, his undeveloped energies, the eternal life of his will, and hope for his restoration to virtue, that scarcely lingers without the limits of certainty, are the ideas that underlie this mighty revolution in modern society.

The very existence of a Reform Association also involves the principles of love as a reformatory power. This we know has been forgotten by many who would earn the title of apostles by railing bitterly against men and institutions; yet this movement could never originate from such individuals, in such a state of mind! Beneficent changes

Digitized by Google

in society are not projected by men who hate, but who love greatly! The fact that such associations exist, is a virtual denial of the method used to reform the world in times past. Once, drunkenness, Sabbath-breaking and profaneness introduced a man to the pillory and the stocks. Now, offenders are delivered over to the persuasions of the Reformers. The Blue-Laws and the Associations respectively characterize the different methods adopted by men to govern the race in the past and present ages. When appeals to the reason and feelings of the erring assume the place of the stake, the rack, or the prison, we may safely infer that a great change has come over the spirit of the community. And this inference is strengthened by the declarations of the more judicious among the reformers. The only weapons they profess to wield are those of kindness. They deprecate compulsion. They ask not the assistance of the master of police, the judge, and the executioner, but rely upon their power to awaken the sympathies and fire the hopes of their weak brethren.

Thus we must acknowledge that trust in the capacity and disposition of man for reformation, and in love and persuasion as the only moving power, lies at the foundation of this feature of the times we are contemplating. It would be easy to illustrate this by an examination of the different schemes of reform among us; but our limits will confine us to a few of those most widely known.

We may select from among these, as best adapted for the illustration, the Temperance Reformation. The restoration of many noble minds to manhood and usefulness, and the increase of outward comfort and domestic happiness, are inferior blessings compared with the great lesson of faith and love it has taught to men. In face of the opposition of enemies and of the unbelief of friends, it has asserted that no man is capable of resisting strenuous and loving appeals to his better nature. And gloriously has the assertion been verified. The crowds of happy and religious men it has snatched from destruction, are living witnesses to the indestructibility of the original tendency to good, and the power of love. The immediate results of a good work are of slight importance compared with the assurances given to our faith, and the impetus imparted to our will. The religion of the world has been elevated, by

Digitized by Google

the trust of six Baltimore inebriates, to a point from which it can never fall. The man whom the eloquence of Channing could never drive from the belief in total depravity, has been compelled to acknowledge the truth in the regeneration of his neighbor from the lowest pit of degradation.

The same ideas lie at the foundation of other associations. What but a faith in love that knows no discouragement, can sustain the friends of peace, before a world to which their wisdom is foolishness? Who, in looking upon the fearful institution of American slavery, so interwoven with all the social, political and religious ideas of a great community, could labor with any spirit of hope for its extermination, unsupported by the same confidence? That body of noble men who have resolved never to rest until the black shadow of the gallows be uplifted from our soil, are sustained by these hopes! and those social reformers, embarked in the most difficult enterprise of all, the attempt to repair the rotten framework of a civilization based on selfishness, move under the guidance of the same load-stars—faith in man, and love for man!

We cannot forbear to notice one of these theories of social reform, because we believe an objection to its details has usually tended to misrepresentation of its leading principles. We speak of the scheme of Fourier for the reorganization of society. In the method of association developed by him, we have little confidence, believing that no man can mark out the channels in which human wants and passions would naturally flow. Between a community fashioned after his plan, and one springing from the real condition of a people, there would be the same difference as between the Erie canal and the Hudson river; the one a sluggish tide, regulated by mechanism, the other reflecting the sky, and flashing round a thousand forests and headlands. That society will one day rise to an elevation, compared with which men are now but a horde of barbarians, we cannot permit ourselves to doubt; but to that lofty ascent we must *climb;* we cannot rise thither in a balloon! It is useless, like the Romans, to build arches and aqueducts to convey a torrent, that, if cleared of obstructions, will at last rise naturally and beautifully to the same height! But while we must dissent from the practical details of this system, we cannot but feel that Fourier

Digitized by Google

is a great benefactor of the race. No one has like him exposed the depths of selfishness and sin that yawn under the flowery walks of modern society. And better than all, the man was "*possessed*" with the noble idea of a community regulated in all things by love. *Attraction* was the central principle around which he strove to arrange all institutions.

Such are the two prominent ideas of this Reform movement; and it surely requires little penetration to discover that they are far in advance of the popular theology. It is a spontaneous protest of man's better nature against doctrines that for ages have been enforced on pain of future destruction. What has Calvinism to do with belief in man's innate goodness? Has it not always sought to glorify God by slander of his noblest work, as if impurity and depravity could flow from the fountain of Divine holiness and beauty? Has it not, with narrow vision, surveyed the human mind, and discovered in the buoyancy of youth nothing but early manifestations of native disobedience; in spontaneous goodness of the soul, a fatal religious delusion; in the natural sentiments of the heart, only the instincts of the tiger, that fights for her young, and of the dog that loves his master? Analyze human nature to a certain point, and it appears devilish. At this point Calvinism has taken its position, and sustained its misinterpretations of God's word by its shallow philosophy. The reformers of the nineteenth century have shown that, beneath this surface, lie the abysses of character, undeveloped energy adequate for every emergency, and longings unutterable for true life. Here God is linked with the soul of man, making known his presence by the tortures of conscience, the aspirations of good hours, the glimpses of heaven, the oft-formed and cherished resolution! To these mysterious chambers of the soul, Calvinism has never descended. It has spoken blasphemy, and will never be admitted to the "Holy of holies." How fearful it is to think of the blindness that comes upon him who loves not! If man deny the existence of virtue, there is for him no excellence. He is left alone in the dreary world of shadows he has made. A narrow soul reads in the penitential Psalms of David, "I was conceived in sin and brought forth in iniquity," a testimony to the doctrine of total

Digitized by Google

depravity; and lo! to him man is totally depraved. The awful and holy depths of character are shrouded in darkness, and he can see only the conventional and the impure. Like a traveller in a vile growth of tangled brushwood and vines, he thinks only of the briars that wound him, forgetting the native richness of the soil under his feet. Our reforms have sprung from deeper sources than this theology ever fathomed. They have snatched out of her hands those ticketed for a journey below, and borne them up triumphantly above the hissing fires, the smoke and the vapor.

And then the reformatory power used by our modern revolutionists in morals, is not that of Calvinism. Its God is not the God of the Reformers. The one is deified vanity, injustice, and caprice; the other, divine love! One deity burns, the other melts us! One is the lightning, the other the sun! Their God is Jehovah, leaning from the clouds in vengeance, with "red right arm" and "garments rolled in blood." The God of the Temperance Society, and of the Peace Society, is the Father, hastening to the prodigal "while yet a great way off." How apparent the contrast between Calvinism, with her penal flames, her curses, her excommunications, and her last adopted child, the gallows,—and the confiding, entreating spirit of Reform! The theology of the past is sick unto death. Not from universities of learning, where scholars moulder over Greek and Hebrew manuscripts, has come the word that has pronounced her doom; but from the depths of that nature in man which she has abused. The "stones have cried out against her." The slave struggling with his chains to spring up a man, the inebriate rising from the way-side, the murderer illumining his cell with the dawn of a holy life, all things low and vile, have started from their lairs, and casting off their sinfulness, have stood up in their native worth before her! She reads her condemnation in the advent of the "Kingdom of Heaven" in these latter days. We honor her for the good she has achieved, and the truth to which she has testified; but we respect not the spirit in which her gifts have been dispensed. The world is passing away from her. She must purify herself, or be left in the receptacle of all worn out things!

Digitized by Google

And herein do we observe the most joyful indication of the times. The hearts of Calvinistic men are too large for their creeds. Their sympathies, so long crushed by a gloomy theology, have rushed like torrents into the channel of reform. It is a noble testimonial to the worth of our nature, that these denominations have almost unanimously thrown themselves into the hottest fight of the new warfare. It is a jubilee for enslaved human nature! A proof that men at heart love to bless, rather than to curse. This outbreak of philanthropy among such men, is not the result of their theology, but of their innate humanity.

We are astonished to hear the great doctrines of human capacity and regeneration so eloquently vindicated in temperance and anti-slavery lectures, by men who in their pulpits cannot go beyond the catechism! We marvel not at this freshness and zeal. God speed you, brethren. Are not your souls refreshed when you can break from the revival, the anxious-seat, and the church-meeting, into the lecture room? Is not the eloquence of the warm heart better than the cant of the synagogue? Is it not, after all, a glorious thing to trust in man's native goodness, and win him by love to virtue? Do not resist this new impulse. It is an inspiration from the "Holy Spirit." Do not stop to ask how it agrees with the creeds, for you will be astonished at the difference; but go on, and by and by you will look back with pity upon the artificial system you miscalled Christianity. This fact, alone, proves that the world is tending to faith in love, to Universalism. The great soul of humanity must renew itself. It cannot always lie under the mountains piled upon it. Like imprisoned lava, it must rush out, though it be for desolation. Thank God! in our day, like an awakened giant, it has slain its taskmasters, and wrought with all its mighty energies in the service of humanity.

Whenever a community arrives at the elevation of a great moral principle, we may expect to see it manifested in many different methods. All varieties of men will express it according to their own form of thought or action. Thus we see the ideas of faith in man and love to man, developing themselves through the reforms no less than through the theology of the age. These have arisen spontaneously in the hearts of men, for the world has come up

Digitized by Google

to them. They are essential to its future progress. This sudden manifestation is not the work of a few men. Ballou and Channing have only given strong utterance to the thought of every mind. While these and other noble defenders of the truth have been laboring upon its theological side, a host of earnest spirits, in obedience to their own impulses, have wrought out its practical application. The reformers of the age complete the circle of its liberal theology. The latter would be but a cold form, if divorced from the former. The strongest proof of its truth, is found in the power of its great ideas to move the dead body of social life!

This view may help us to indicate the relation between the church and the reformers. There has been mutual recrimination between them. The reformers are indignant that the church has not in all cases arrayed herself under their party banners; and the church equally outraged at the want of reverence displayed by these new soldiers of the cross. We believe this controversy can be decided in no other way than by indicating the respective duties of each. It is one mission of a true church to treasure up the good results of the actions of every age. It is the storehouse of religious ideas. Whatever truth has been wrought out by the spontaneous action of the time, is here preserved in a form to meet the wants of succeeding generations. Theological systems are the result of all the actions of the past. Such is the order of nature. As we have before intimated, truth is developed first in spontaneous action, thence passing into literature and theology. If the church desert her peculiar sphere to plunge into every new form of benevolent enterprise, she is only disqualifying herself for a higher duty. We have no sympathy with the hostile attitude assumed by many of our theologians to the reformers of the day. The church must see, in the birth of each of these, the development of a religious idea, and be ready, in all suitable modes, by encouragement and assistance, to aid in preserving that idea in its purity. But the duties of the minister and the reformer are not always the same. They may be laboring to establish a common principle, but the one must regard it in its theological and religious aspects, the other in its social and political. The true preacher aims to interpret the passing shows of the time;

Digitized by Google

to detect the presence of truth in every new public movement; to appreciate all the results of social action; to separate the eternal thoughts of the age from the transitory and local. And this he cannot do as a mere reformer. He cannot perform the work of the church and the association at the same time. Both are equally important. Either is incomplete without the other. It is an indication of a narrow spirit in one to censure the other for laboring in its own vocation.

It would be interesting to trace this reform spirit in its results upon legislation and life, but the completeness of our subject does not demand it. We have shown the ideas implied in the movement, and their inconsistency with the popular theology. No one can doubt whither we are tending. The central truth of Universalism is the central truth of the age; and it must pass into our social and political existence, or we can have no hope for the future.

A. D. M.

Art. XXV.

Philosophy Imperfect—Christianity Perfect.

In the time of Paul, there were those who considered it foolishness to preach Christ and him crucified, for the purpose of enlightening and saving sinners.

Those entertaining this opinion were Grecian philosophers, who possessed the highest worldly advantages that could be enjoyed for obtaining wisdom, and who had reached the most advanced state of perfection, to which human means could raise them.

They prided themselves on their learning and eloquence, and looked with disdain upon all who had not been enlightened by their wisdom, or who imagined that there was a source of knowledge higher and more ample than their philosophy.

The terms in which they speak of Christianity were

Digitized by Google

most contemptuous. They declared that it was foolishness; that it comported neither with reason nor common sense, and was opposed to all that was dignified and philosophic. In reply to these charges, the apostle declares, that by human wisdom, men had never obtained a knowledge of God; never ascertained in what true happiness consisted, and never succeeded in rendering men virtuous; and he referred to that divine prediction in which it was said, "I will explode the philosophy of the philosophers, and will set aside the learning of the scribes as useless, by making the preaching of a crucified Saviour more effectual than either for reforming the world." And with great force he asked, "Where is the philosopher? where the scribe? where the sceptic of this world? Hath not God shown the foolishness of the wisdom of this world; the inefficiency of philosophy in bringing men to the knowledge of God and to the practice of virtue, by leaving them so long to its guidance without effect? For when, in the wise government of God, experience had shown that the world, through philosophy, did not attain the knowledge of God, it pleased God, through what the philosophers called the foolishness of public preaching, to save them who believe the things preached concerning the Lord Jesus." He, therefore, inferred that the foolishness of God, the method chosen by God which men reckon foolishness, was wiser, because more effectual, than any method devised by men; and the weak instruments employed by God were stronger than those thought strong by men.[1] Hence, he concluded, that it was wholly owing to God, to the divine nature of the gospel, which was a wisdom better than any scheme of philosophy, and produced a righteousness not to be obtained by philosophy, that the preaching of the apostles was attended with such wonderful success.

That the apostle was right will be evident, if we consider the imperfection of philosophy, and the perfection of Christianity. My limits will not permit me to speak in detail of the philosophy which arrayed itself against Christianity, or to describe the different systems of philosophy which it encountered in Greece. I can do no more than

[1] I have followed Macknight's paraphrase of Paul's language.

Digitized by Google

show that no philosophy was an adequate guide in matters of faith and practice. I ask, then, what did the philosophers teach?

1. They taught that though there is an infinite God, he is so far above this world, as to take but little interest in its affairs. Hence, while they admitted a Supreme God, they worshiped idols; and the great mass of the people were wholly ignorant of any other Deity. The heathen had thirty thousand gods! 2. The philosophers taught that worship consisted in offering sacrifices to the gods; and that calamities were the result of their anger, which must be appeased by rich presents and costly offerings. 3. The philosophers taught, that suicide was commendable, and pointed out the ways in which it could be committed. Some of them taught that all crimes were alike; that lying was not sinful, and that truth was honorable only when advantageous. Some taught that the forgiveness of injuries was weak and mean. Plato says this was the general sentiment of the philosophers. Some allowed of excessive drinking, and some a community of women. Cicero asks, speaking of the character of the philosophers, "Who is there of all the philosophers, whose mind, life, and manners were conformable to right reason? who ever made his philosophy the law and rule of his life, and not a mere show of his wit and parts? who observed his instructions, and lived in obedience to his own precepts?" On the contrary, many of them were slaves to filthy lusts; many to pride, many to covetousness, &c.[2] All these vices are condemned in the strongest terms by Christianity, and a system of moral duty, entirely different in its character and effects, is urged in the most authoritative manner. 4. The philosophers, generally, denied a future existence. They had no faith in such an existence that afforded them any substantial comfort. This is true of Socrates, Plato and Cicero. But a short time before his death, Socrates said, "I shall die, and you will continue to live; but which of us will be in the better state, is known only to God. I hope I am going to good men, but this I would not confidently assert." Notwithstanding all the arguments used by Cicero to prove another life, he admits that it is doubtful. So unsatisfactory

[2] Quoted from "Christianity against Infidelity."

Digitized by Google

was the evidence, that when Christ made his appearance, there were but few that had any hope that they should live after death. Hence, Paul represents the heathen as sorrowing for the dead without hope.

From the foregoing facts, we see the imperfection of philosophy. It has no light by which to guide the soul. It can speak with no certainty on the character of God, the nature of worship, the duties of life, or the destiny of man. Though great truths, on all these points, were taught by philosophy, they were never supported by any evidence that was satisfactory. They were mere speculations, that left the mind in doubt. None reposed a strong confidence in them. None looked upon them as the Christian does upon revelation. The most confident could only say, "Possibly we are right." How could they have said more, when there was a general conflict of opinions among the wisest and most renowned of the philosophers?

If any further evidence be required to show the imperfection of philosophy, we have only to appeal to Paul. He explicitly pronounces it, in all respects, deficient—as false in its essential doctrines; false in its rules of religious and moral duties; and false in its representations of human destiny. If it be said, "Man has been perfected since the days of Paul, and can see with a clearer vision than he then could," we demand the proof. We know of nothing which gives the least support to such an assertion. What evidence have we, from nature, of another life, which the old philosophers had not? What law has been revealed which they did not understand? What germ of immortality discovered, of which they were ignorant? Ah, it is true now as ever, that the wisdom of man is foolishness with God.

Having thus shown the imperfection of philosophy, I will proceed to consider the perfection of Christianity. This was in all respects perfect. It was perfect, 1. Because it revealed God as a perfect Being. It represented him as infinitely wise, good, great, and just; as the Creator of all things; the Governor and Judge of all men; the eternal Friend of equity and righteousness; the merciful and bountiful Benefactor of all men; their gracious and compassionate Father and Saviour. There is no perfection of which we can conceive, that it does not ascribe to

Digitized by Google

him. 2. It required spiritual worship. Making all worship consist in love, reverence and gratitude, in the sincere homage of the spirit, it prescribes only those rites which accord with such worship, and which are the true expression of a soul filled with love, reverence and gratitude, and that are calculated to awaken these in the heart. Unlike heathenism, the worship required by Christianity is not for the benefit of God, or to influence his determinations, but to benefit man — to control his affections and his life. 3. It inculcated a perfect system of moral duty. It prohibited wrong of every kind; injustice, falsehood, deception, revenge, cruelty, and every other wrong of which we can conceive. On the other hand, it required every thing that was right; the truth on all occasions; justice in all dealings; integrity, kindness, love, generosity, forbearance, forgiveness, and whatever men would that others should do to them. It also required that men should love their enemies, bless those who curse them, and do good to those who hate them. 4. It taught all the moral duties relating immediately to ourselves. It gave wise and perfect rules for the government of our affections, our appetites, our passions, our temper; so that were these rules regarded, there would be no moral impurities among men; no unnatural lusts; no sinful desires. 5. It exhibited a perfect pattern for the imitation of man. Jesus was the model of every virtue, the fulness of all moral excellence, and if we imitate him, we are certain to keep the whole law. 6. It presented a perfect image of the invisible God. In Jesus dwelt the fulness of the Godhead. He was the brightness of the Father's glory, and the express image of his person. In him was beheld the impartial love, the free grace, the saving mercy, and all the moral glories of the Father; so that he could say, "He that hath seen me, hath seen the Father also." 7. It revealed a future life. It gave the most positive assurance of such a life that could possibly be presented; so that the true believer was enabled to say, "I know that my Redeemer liveth, and that I shall live forever." How elevating and comforting was this assurance! 8. It exhibited the true nature of rewards and punishments. It declared that such was the character of God, such the nature of virtue and vice, and such the agreement between the divine laws and man,

Digitized by Google

as a physical, intellectual and moral being, that every virtuous act was certain to receive its reward, and every evil act was certain to be justly and fully punished. 9. It appealed to the true motives for the government of man. It taught, that man ought to obey its requisitions, because they were wise, just and good; because they accorded with the fitness of things, and were productive of his highest happiness; because the signal favors of free grace and mercy demand a life of obedience; because Christ laid down his life that man might know the way of obedience and walk therein; because without obedience man can neither be safe nor happy, and because his honor and usefulness was in proportion to his obedience. 10. It was clothed with a divine authority. It was confirmed by signs and wonders; by miracles which proved that it was from God, and given to be a rule of faith and practice to all men in all ages and conditions.

Such was Christianity, as preached eighteen hundred years ago in those cities where boasting philosophy had sought in vain, for ages on ages, to enlighten and elevate and purify the people. Do I then claim too much, when I affirm, that it was a perfect religion? When I say perfect, I do not mean perfect when considered with reference to the institutions in existence at the time of its promulgation. There have been many plans devised for improving the condition of society, that had a peculiar fitness to their times, and were well adapted to the condition of the people as then situated. But a change in their situation, and the overthrow of the then existing institutions, rendered those plans wholly useless. For instance, we have societies formed for the purpose of enlightening the public mind in regard to the evils and wrongs of the death-penalty; and we labor, by the publication of books and papers, and by the delivery of lectures, to secure the abolition of that penalty. But no matter how wise and perfect our means are, and how well suited to their end, when the death-penalty shall have been everywhere abolished, these means will be no longer useful. So we have measures for the spread of peace-principles, and to show the evil, the sin, the folly and the horrors of war; but when swords are beaten into plough-shares, and spears into pruning-hooks, these measures, perfect as they are, will be useless.

Digitized by Google

Now the perfection of Christianity is not such a perfection. Since its promulgation in Judea, there have been numerous revolutions; empires have arisen and fallen; various forms of government have one after another been established; great advances in science, in knowledge, in refinement, and all the arts of life, have been made; and yet, Christianity is just as well suited to the condition of society, as existing at the present day, as to the society existing when it was first promulgated; it has not grown old; not been outgrown; not become useless or antiquated. The reason is, it was not given for one age, one country, one state of society; but for all ages, all countries, and all states of society. He that gave it knew what was in man; what evils he had to cure; what wants to satisfy; what powers to perfect; and he knew how to cure those evils, satisfy those wants, and perfect those powers; and knowing all this, he was able to form a perfect religion—one adapted to all men in all ages.

Again. When I say, Christianity was perfect, I do not mean perfect when considered with reference to the developments made in the intellectual and moral world at the time of its promulgation. There is a great deal said in our times about progress and reform; and notwithstanding all the cant used respecting these, there is much of gladdening, glorious truth in what is said. Men have progressed, wonderfully progressed. Mighty and blessed reforms have been effected; reforms that enable us to hope for the final renovation of the earth, and the universal spread of liberty and love. What a reform was that when England emancipated its slaves in the West Indies! The history of England presents us many noble and encouraging reforms. How many reforms have been effected with reference to Ireland; and how many with reference to its own government. Its revolutions are nearly all forward. Few of them are backward movements. What is true of England is true of many other nations. What a revolution has temperance achieved in Ireland. And what an advance, too, has Ireland made, in the measures employed to secure its rights. Though groaning under a weight of wrongs that have been accumulating for ages, and though its people are quick, impulsive, and rash, they have scorned all carnal weapons. O, how good it is to see

Digitized by Google

them stand up, and move onward, in the might of moral power. Everywhere we behold reform. How is it in our midst? What is the temperance movement; the anti-slavery movement; the abolition of the death-penalty movement; the prison-discipline movement; and the movement in behalf of discharged convicts? Are not these great and glorious reforms? The human mind seems to have thrown off its chains, and to feel its true freedom to think and act for itself. Wonderful discoveries have been made — truths of a mighty moral power have been unfolded! And yet, not one step has been taken beyond Christianity; all the truths that have been brought out, were taught by Christ eighteen hundred years ago. We saw them not before, because we stood in a false position; prejudice and education had made thick scales with which our eyes were blinded. And now, because some of those scales have fallen off, and we begin to see with a clearer vision, we leap about with a frantic joy, and vainly imagine that we see even more than Christ did; when the fact is, these very truths which make us so frantic, Christ himself taught and lived; and, advance as we may, go upward and onward as we may, and there the Master will still be, far above us, and far beyond us, still bidding us to study and follow him!

Men, I know, in their conceit and folly, have said, that from among men, and with no special help from God, Christs far greater than the Christ of the gospels will arise. Conceited mortals! Ages on ages of progress will do comparatively nothing towards rendering the wisest and best among us the equals of Jesus. Greater Christs appear! For what? What truth do we need that Jesus did not teach? What precept that he did not enforce? What example he did not set? What assurance of another life he did not give? Go on, ye lovers of progress and reform; leap forward with all the divine strength that religion can give; and you will still find the Master far in advance; and when the day shall come, that, throughout all the wide earth, there shall be nothing selfish or sinful in the human heart, Christ and his religion will still be among the highest aids we can have, to still greater attainments in holiness! There is a world of truth in what the Protestant friends of Germany say, when they declare, "That Christianity is

Digitized by Google

the only religion calculated for the whole world, and for every age of its existence." Is not this self-evident from the fact that every new, and farther advanced age, better than the preceding, understands what the Saviour meant, and what was his mind and will, in the same manner as the revelation God has given is even more fully apprehended from his works?

If right in the foregoing views, those are wrong who fancy that there are truths, which philosophy, nature, experience, and the intuitions of the soul, have unfolded, that transcend the teachings of Christianity. I mean, of course, moral truths; for Christianity claims not to teach astronomy, physiology, or chemistry, though all its teachings correspond with these, and with every other true science, inasmuch as all truth is in harmony. We hear a great deal said in our times about preaching other truths besides those of Christianity; and the men who cling to the Bible as their text-book, and make it the basis of all their sermons, are called conservatives, enemies of progress, men who hold to tradition, and who are chained to the past! What does all this mean? Do those who speak thus, wish to be understood that there is any source from which we can obtain more positive information concerning God, his character, his purposes, his government and plan of salvation, or concerning man, his duties, moral and religious, and his destination, than the Bible affords? Do they intend to say, that in the progress of society human rights have been discovered of which the Bible does not speak; principles have been developed not found in Christianity; and that means of moving people to duty, have been unfolded, that are more efficacious than those which Christianity furnishes? If they mean this, let them say it distinctly; and we shall then know, that they believe Christianity to be, not a divine, but a human system; not a perfect, but an imperfect system; and that they claim that men may be wiser than Christ and his apostles.

If it be said, We mean not this; we mean only that all truth should be preached; we ask again, What they mean by preaching all truth? There is the science of hydrostatics; shall we preach that? It is truth. There also is the science of pneumatics; shall we preach that? It is

Digitized by Google

truth. There, too, are the sciences of mathematics and of trigonometry. These are truths; shall they be preached? Then, there are the great political questions of the day, such as the Tariff and the Currency. Shall we preach what we believe to be the truth in regard to these? If so, let those who demand to have all truth preached, set the example. The fact is, there are thousands of truths that are not suitable themes for the pulpit; they belong to other departments of life. The great work of the pulpit is to educate the religious and moral nature of man. For this it was set up, and to this God has consecrated it. And that the pulpit may answer its end, God has given his ministers a religion to preach, and one adequate to all the wants of men. While he bids them preach this boldly, faithfully, and free from all the mixtures of human inventions, he declares, for their encouragement, that it is the power of God unto salvation.

But though he bids them preach the gospel in its purity and simplicity, by the example of all his inspired teachers, he bids them illustrate and enforce it, by all the teachings of nature, reason, experience and science. According to Christianity, God is wise and great. All nature confirms this truth; for every mountain that rears its top to the skies, every star that glitters in the heavens, is a monument of divine wisdom and power. Astronomy discloses innumerable proofs of God's wisdom and greatness. The heavens declare his glory. According to Christianity God is love. Of this great truth, nature affords many proofs. The sun shines, the rains fall, and the earth yields her increase, for the benefit of man. Every design of Deity, which nature reveals, is benevolent. But in reading the volume of nature for proofs of divine goodness, we discover dark pages; we see not always the design of God. In surveying the divine works, we find dark and winding passages through which no mortal ever yet passed, without the Christian's lamp to guide him. I know those who boast of the teachings of nature, think differently. But they have a divine lamp, deny it as they may, by which to be led, and by which to be guided through the dark and winding ways which occasionally open before them. With that lamp all is plain; but let them throw aside their lamp, and their condition will be the same as that of the old phi-

Digitized by Google

losophers, who confessed their ignorance of God, his nature and designs. Much then, as the gospel may be illustrated and enforced by appeals to nature, this is, comparatively speaking, a dark volume, unless illumined by the light of revelation; and he who would throw away the gospel because the volume of nature is open to his view, is much like him who would blot out the sun, because he can have a lamp to guide his steps. So he that would preach nature, rather than the gospel, would prefer the lesser to the greater light.

Again. Christianity teaches that we are all brethren, and that all men should love each other. Nature affords many proofs of our universal brotherhood. All men have essentially the same physical organization; all the same appetites and passions; all the same affections and sympathies; all have a conscience to bind them to what is right and true; all have the same desire for immortality and happiness; and all are alike dependent upon God and each other. What a confirmation is here of the great fact, that God made of one blood all nations, that dwell on all the face of the earth. Nature also presents many reasons for loving each other. It teaches that we should love each other because love makes us happy, because we can be mutual helps, and because we are all, at times, placed in circumstances in which we must have assistance, or perish. The sick are thus situated; so are those, struck down by accident, and those who have been reduced to want by the wasting elements, or the hand of fraud. All these considerations show that we should love each other; and they may be urged in proof of the wisdom and goodness of those commands, which bid us love all men, and do good to all as we have opportunity. I say not then that the minister, in enforcing the doctrines of a universal brotherhood and a universal love, shall confine himself solely to the Scriptures. Let him appeal to nature, to reason, to society, and to every thing that would illustrate and enforce what he would teach. But because illustrations and enforcements may be thus gathered from the outward world and from society, shall we leave the higher rule, and that which God has given by a special revelation? Go out of the Bible! Leave the Bible! Preach all truth! Should we not rather say, Take the Bible always

Digitized by Google

with you; let it be your pillar of a cloud by day, and of fire by night; and as you follow where it leads, permit every thing to speak that will corroborate its truths, or lead you to see the worth, the fitness, the necessity of its laws?

What I have said, in regard to the foregoing truths, is applicable to all the truths of the Bible. I would have every light that shines in the universe, whether great or small, pour its rays upon the truths God has revealed for our guidance, in order that our path of duty may be illumined by all the light that shines from heaven and earth. But while I would do this, I would protest against excluding the light from heaven; for to me it seems like folly to shut our eyes against the brightest and surest light, and follow one that is dim and uncertain. It was the dimness and uncertainty of all the lights of nature, that caused the apostle to say, The wisdom of this world is foolishness with God. I object not to the study of philosophy. Let every man be a philosopher. There is philosophy in all truth. But let no man put human philosophy above the Bible.

But it is said, in our adherence to the Bible, we forget the evils of life; that we ought to leave the Bible, and preach about the sins of society, its wrongs and oppressions, and help on the great reforms of the world. "Leave the Bible, and preach about sin and reforms!" What will not man say next? Where are we to obtain our ideas of sin and oppression, except from the Bible? And whence that high sense of duty, that enlarged benevolence, that spirit of self-sacrifice, which demand all the reforms, except from the Bible? Look all over Christendom, and what do you see, but old errors, and wrongs, and oppressions, and vices, giving way before the advancing light of the gospel? Then, step over the boundaries of Christendom into Pagan lands, and if you except those which are improving from their intercourse with Christians, they are not advancing a single step; the public mind is not advancing in knowledge; the public heart not enlarging in benevolence; the old tyrannies and superstitions and follies are still retained; and the people, as in ages on ages ago, are groaning in misery, and groping their way in darkness! And yet we are bidden to leave the Bible, and labor for reforms, when all true reforms have their origin in the Bible; and when it is by applying its doctrines and pre-

Digitized by Google

cepts to society; by enforcing the scriptural representations of justice and injustice, of good and evil, of love and mercy, that all the reforms have been effected.

Take a case. It is not long since it was thought, that man was inferior to station and law and custom, and that he had no natural rights, and that he might be trampled upon with impunity. But it has been found that every man is a child of God, made in God's image, and has rights with which none can interfere; and since this has been discovered, man has been looked upon as something greater than station or custom, and every law which interferes with his rights has been pronounced unjust and oppressive. And now, when we see a man, no matter how ignorant, how degraded, how sinful he may be, we feel that he has rights which we must respect, and that, instead of crushing him, we must seek to do him good. We learned all this from the Bible.

Take another case. It is not long since, the sole reliance was placed upon cruelty for restraining crime, for enforcing law, and for promoting the welfare of society. We had cruel laws, cruel penalties, cruel officers of justice, and cruel hearts. We now see that this was a false philosophy; that justice can do more for men than injustice, clemency than cruelty, love than hatred. The most abundant experience now testifies, that the only way to overcome evil, is by the agency of love. There are countless facts like the following: "How dost thou manage," said one Quaker preacher to another, "to take so much more hold of the hearts of the people than I do?" "I can explain it," answered the one addressed, "in a few words: I tell people, that if they do right, they shall not be whipped. Thou sayest, that if they don't do right, they shall be whipped."

Here is a great principle. We are not to drive men—not to force them by an appeal to their fears; but we are to encourage them, address their better feelings, and awaken high and holy aspirations. Now, to hear some reformers speak of this principle, you would suppose that they originated it; that they are its authors; and that they can justly say to Jesus and the apostles, Stand back—we have found a cure for all ills; we are the saviours of the race! I have seen so much of this self-glorification, that it has

Digitized by Google

become wearisome. Why, this very principle, which these men boast of originating, is the great basis of Christianity. Jesus taught it in all his sermons; he exhibited it in all his life; and it was the glory of his death. What we want, in order to reform the world, is to have men act upon this principle; to adopt it as their rule of life. I do not charge all who say, Let us go out of the Bible for some of our sermons, with claiming to have originated this law of love and kindness; but I would ask, even those who make no such claim, what ministers can do better than to apply this law to society; apply it in correcting the wrongs which exist, and in making men live together in concord and peace?

Leave the Bible! Why, leaving that has been the great curse of the world. Men have preached their creeds, and by the agency of these have corrupted society, and introduced a reign of cruelty, hatred and revenge. What we want is to bring men back to the Bible, that truth may enlighten and sanctify the heart; that all may have a true standard of character; and that they may see the sin of intemperance, oppression and hatred; and labor, with wise means, and a true spirit, to do good. In a word, we want God's truth applied to the world for the correction of evil, and the perfection of society in kindness and love. It is not those, then, who take Christianity for their guide, that neglect to preach against sin and labor for reforms; for this is the very work to which Christianity is perpetually calling us; and if we do neglect the work, it will not be from fidelity to Christianity, but from a want of fidelity to it. Christianity is perfect. If you would enlighten the ignorant, you must do it by its wisdom; if you would save the sinner, you must do it by its agency; if you would lift man to the high station for which he was created, you must do it by its power; and if you would be successful in warring against the vices of the world, you must clothe yourself with its panoply, and arm yourself with its weapons. Christianity is the light, the salvation, the glory of the world; and blessed is that minister who makes it the great theme of his preaching. Christ's minister should preach his word. O. A. S.

Digitized by Google

Art. XXVI.

The Faith requisite to Christian Fellowship.

Religion, when developed in the mind, may be said to consist of two elements, distinguishable, in general terms, as the intellectual and the moral: on the one hand, knowledge, or belief, of certain objective truths, real or supposed; on the other hand, corresponding affections, or moral sentiments. Perhaps a thorough analysis would reduce each of these into minuter subdivisions. Be this as it may, the two-fold distinction just mentioned will be generally acknowledged, and it will also be sufficient for the purposes of illustration now in view. A religion lying only in the intellect, (if in that case it could be called by the name,) would be nothing but a lifeless theory; lying exclusively in the moral nature, it would be simply the religious propensity, undeveloped, and indeed blind, as are all the propensities, abstractly considered. The problem is, to bring these two elements into due proportion with one another, so as to give each its legitimate influence. In actual life, they are seldom, perhaps never, found among men, in perfect equipose. One of them preponderates now, and now the other; so impracticable is it in this, as in every thing else, to preserve exactly the balance. There have been entire sects, as the Antinomians and some of the Mystics, so far one-sided, in this respect, that they have tried to make religion consist wholly of one element, to the exclusion of the other. These are always short-lived; their struggle against nature being too desperate and exhausting to endure. There are periods, also, in the progress of almost every sect, when it is unconsciously carried, by the force of circumstances, to one extreme or the other; but such are the laws of human action, that these periods are usually followed by an oscillation over to the opposite extravagance; and this, again, by a return back. The pendulum does not rest at the medium, unless the clock itself stops.

In times past, the prevailing error of the Christian world,

Digitized by Google

in this respect, has probably been too exclusive a regard to the dogmatical element as the religious criterion. We do not say, too great a regard, but too exclusive. From this have arisen, ostensibly at least, though actually but in part, those outrages that mark the history of the Church: cruel and bloody persecutions for mere faith; ecclesiastical tyranny over thought; suppression of free inquiry, and violent abuse of every new tenet. At the present, however, the general tendency is obviously in the contrary direction. Former abuses, which indeed are not yet done away in every quarter, have awakened a jealousy even of any censure that may be passed on one's faith; and the slavery in which thought had so long been held, has roused the public mind to a vehement assertion of the right of private judgment. Happy, if the tendency would stop here! but judging from what has been, in similar cases, have we any right to expect that it will run into no extravagances in this movement? Will the pendulum stop just at the centre of gravity?

Partly from this reaction, and partly from other causes which it is unnecessary here to specify, there seems to have arisen, among the so called liberal sects, both in Europe and in this country, a vague way of thinking on the subject of faith, a merely rhetorical treatment of it, purposely disparaging the importance of definite belief. We may not be able to state the doctrine, or way of treatment, with perfect accuracy, nor to make just allowance for the modifications that are often introduced; and therefore we shall not pretend to do so. But it appears to us, that, if carried out to its full and systematic expression, it would amount to something like the following: That Christianity is merely a spiritual life, in distinction from any creed whatsoever; a moral affection only, and not an intellectual act also; that its only essential faith is not a belief in any definite truths, but a sentiment, namely, confidence in the True abstractly, in the Right, the Good, &c.; that to require any dogmatical tenet whatsoever, or any set of such tenets, we mean as indispensable to the Christian character and name, is to lord it over conscience; that the spirit is every thing, in this respect, and belief nothing; and that, if a man appear to have the spirit of Christianity, and then call himself a Christian, we must acknowledge him as such, whatsoever

Digitized by Google

he believes or disbelieves. It may be well to take notice, that this is not only one-sided, but goes over to the utmost extreme; so that if any extravagance be possible in this direction, it is realized here. The opposite extreme would be Antinomianism sublimated. Perhaps the position, however, is never maintained in quite so complete a form as we have given it. Still, we think it is all implied, at least, in certain hypotheses, and especially in many appeals and arguments, which have been advanced, even by some who were themselves devout believers in Jesus Christ, and who needed, on their own account, none of the latitude for which they pleaded in behalf of others.

We would observe, here, that, as the doctrine in question would probably have no effect when urged by a known sceptic, it is only to believers in the Christian Revelation that the following remarks will be addressed. It is not our business, now, to convince the infidel of Christianity, nor to prove either the divine authority of Jesus Christ or the authenticity of the New Testament. Taking it for granted that all this is cordially believed both by writer and reader, we shall proceed to inquire only into this one point, namely, What faith, if any, is indispensable to a Christian? we mean in such a sense as that, without it, a man is not a Christian, whatsoever other qualifications he may have. Or, to put the same question in other words, What faith is requisite to Christian fellowship?

Perhaps we ought to begin further back, and ask, Is any faith at all absolutely necessary to this purpose? Is not the moral element, alone, sufficient? For example: Here is one who believes neither in any God nor in any future state; and yet he is a good man, loves his neighbor as himself, is pure in his life, and reverences truth and goodness in a far higher degree than most Christians do. Now, shall we acknowledge this Atheist a Christian? A very important question! which reaches farther than we may at first suppose. The answer will, of course, be, No. What, then, becomes of the position that we have no right to regard a man's faith in judging whether he is a Christian? Perhaps it will be replied, that we may still avoid trenching upon that, for we may say that this Atheist's disqualification does not lie in the fact that he has no faith in God and immortality, but in his want of the affections which correspond to those

Digitized by Google

truths, — he cannot revere the one, nor exercise the feelings that are called forth by the other. Well, then, in order to mark the ground, distinctly, to which we have now come, let us say, that had he but the affections requisite in these respects, his Atheism would be no bar to Christian fellowship. Is this what we mean? If so, we must remember, what we have already intimated, that he does reverence truth, justice, goodness, and all the abstract perfections; as some Atheists have actually done. And, now, can we, on the principle in question, *legitimate* the necessity of any thing more? of his believing in a *personal* Being, to whom he shall first ascribe these attributes, and then revere them, in Him, rather than in their abstract state? Is not the moral sentiment, in the man, the same in both cases? If we say it is not, then we have found one case, at least, in which we pronounce it impossible for the sentiment itself to exist, or to be genuine, howsoever it may appear, unless it be called forth by faith of a peculiar kind, — one case, in which we judge the sentiment by the faith. And having once admitted this principle, it would be capricious to deny it in any other case which it legitimately involves. Or, if we say it is the same in both cases, then we only come still more directly to the conclusion, that faith, in addition to the moral sentiment, is requisite; that is, unless we reverse our former answer, by acknowledging this Atheist to be a Christian; and, indeed, unless we go the whole length of maintaining that Atheism and Theism hold the same relation to the essentials of Christianity, — both of them equally indifferent in this respect.

We need not, however, pursue this abstract reasoning farther, at present. It will be better, perhaps, to illustrate our subject by examples. Take, then, another case: Here is a very devout, exemplary and benevolent Polytheist; a heathen, but very religious, and of extraordinary moral excellence. There have been such. Now, this man believes both in a future state and in a God, — in as many Gods, indeed, as are recognized in the Greek and Roman mythologies; only, they are of a very different kind. And he reveres them; he lives on the hope of immortality. Is he a Christian, by virtue of his moral and religious affections? and shall we ordain him as a Christian minister, if he wishes it, and send him forth, with our sanction, as such,

Digitized by Google

to preach his Polytheism, together with his better views of spiritual life? We trust these questions will be answered with reference to the principle under examination, that it is a man's life, without regard to his belief, which determines whether he is a Christian.

Again: shall we receive, as a Christian, a man who does not believe there ever was such a person as Jesus Christ? Suppose that the man has an excellent spirit, and that, in this respect, he is better than the generality of Christians; that he is distinguished far above them by his lively sympathy with his race, by devotion to every benevolent enterprise, by refined culture, by moral integrity, and also by piety to God, — trusting, affectionate, childlike piety. But he regards the whole story of Christ's existence as a fable, as one of the old myths, and treats it as such. By some peculiar idiosyncrasies of mind, or by some distorting medium through which he has trained himself to view the subject, he has come at length to discover, as he thinks, several moral faults even in the character which the evangelical mythologists present as that of their imaginary Jesus. It is not, to him, a perfect model-character, after all; and he therefore impeaches it, and tries to open the eyes of Christendom to its few and slight blemishes. We, however, see that his own ideal of excellence, so far as we can perceive what it is, answers very well to the character which Christ appears to us to wear in the Gospels, and which our speculatist has in some things mistaken. Now, shall we say that this avowed Deist is a Christian, and entitled to Christian fellowship? We presume the answer, here too, will be, No. But why? simply, because he has no faith in Jesus Christ. Had he this, together with all his other qualifications, he would be one of the best of Christians. This is the only thing wanting to that end; — which is the same as to say that faith, so much faith at least, is absolutely requisite, and that no moral or religious affections can, in this respect, compensate for the lack of it. This is one ground. The other alternative is, to say that he is a Christian, by virtue of the rule that no man's faith is to be inquired into; and, consequently, that we must concede, to the disbeliever in Jesus Christ, the same right to the Christian name and fellowship, that a believer in him has. One of these alternatives must be taken.

Digitized by Google

Or, in order to escape this dilemma, will it be said that it is not his want of faith which excludes this Deist, but his neglecting to claim the title of Christian? Even on this ground, however, we involve ourselves in the latter alternative, namely, that a disbeliever in Christ is entitled, equally with a believer, to the Christian name and fellowship, if he but assert his claim. Besides, we would ask, what his asserting it has to do with the matter of fact which lies beneath, and on which alone his claim could be justly founded? Either he is a Christian, or he is not, let him take what name he may, — this cannot change the fact. To say that a man's calling himself a Christian makes him one, would, in point of logic, be on a level with the famous paradox, of believing a proposition, not because it is true, but to make it true. There is, indeed, an old proverb that whatsoever a man calls himself, he will pass for; but it has not been usual seriously to recommend this as a rule of action, except in matters of indifference. If a Deist can *rightfully* call himself a Christian, it is, of course, only on the ground that he is already one, antecedently to his taking the name; in which case we ought to give it to him, whether he claims his due or not. On the other hand, if he assume it against right, we ought not to sanction his wrong. Do we not see that there is danger of trifling with a name, which we doubtless mean to hold sacred, if we deal it out, together with the consequent fellowship, at the caprice of mere assumption, and without regard to intrinsical propriety? Indeed, so far as we do this, we make Christianity but a name.

But, passing over all these considerations, should it still be pleaded that, even in the case supposed, we have no right to take cognizance of the man's faith, or to inquire whether he is a Deist in belief or not; that it is enough that we find him a good man, actuated apparently by a Christian spirit; and that, if he will now but call himself a Christian, we must acknowledge him as such, Deist though he may be, — should this be asserted, it may be well to carry our supposition a step farther, so as to exemplify the alleged rule, and imbody it in practice. Say, then, that the same man, just as we have described him, an avowed Deist, claims nevertheless to be a Christian; having been persuaded that he may honestly do so, in his sense of the

Digitized by Google

term — that is, in the mythological sense. He wishes to be a preacher, but dislikes to go forth alone, like other reformers, without sympathy, without countenance, to endure the life-long exclusion from "respectable" society, the contempt and suffering, usually incurred in building up a sect *de novo.* He knows that the name of Christian, and the degree of fellowship connected with it, are a passport into a great number of churches, respectable institutions, and, in one word, into the Christian community: a wide field! which he wishes to occupy in teaching, partly for general good, and especially for the purpose of inculcating his peculiar tenets, under all the sanction which that appellation gives when generally acknowledged. He reconciles the assumption of it, with honesty, on the ground that it sprang from a fable, as he is about to show; that it is only a mythological term; that Christians themselves contend that whatever meaning it has is not historical but moral; and that, in this sense, it comes near enough to his own idea, to justify his appropriation of it — comes nearer, indeed, than any other denomination that is current and in good repute. And, then, it is a great and beneficent work, in his view, to break down all that remains of the exclusiveness which superstitious bigotry had drawn around the name, and to bring about such a state of things as that moral excellence, disenthralled from faith, shall have untrammelled and unquestioned range from the outer court to the *Sanctum Sanctorum* itself. He disbelieves, and denies that there ever was any real Jesus Christ, but claims to be a Christian on the ground just explained. What shall we do? There are two ways, for choice: either to acknowledge his claim, on the principle of refusing to look into his faith; or else to deny his claim, and at the same time to deny the rule that every good man, who calls himself a Christian, is to be fellowshipped as such, without regard to his faith. It seems important that we decide, which of these two positions we will hold; for we cannot compound them, nor can we conceive of a third in the case.

Let us, however, proceed with our illustration. We will change the case, in one particular: Suppose that the man we have described, with all his moral and religious excellences, does at length believe in Jesus Christ, in the

Digitized by Google

proper sense of that phrase. There will be no question that he is a Christian, now, though he were not before. But here is one circumstance we have not yet mentioned. Through excessive modesty, conscientiousness, reverence, or something else, he declines, as did Cowper even in his lucid intervals, to call himself a Christian, and is hardly willing to receive the title from others. Not that his faith in Christ is at all doubtful, nor his Christian spirit; the only difficulty is, that he cannot make up his mind to claim the honor of a name to him so sacred. Shall we, therefore, reverse our judgment of him, and, out of deference to the rule of pronouncing every good man to be whatsoever he calls himself, refuse to say that he is a Christian? This would evidently be absurd. Neither his assuming the name, nor his neglecting to assume it, alters the fact, or our judgment of the fact, when we are once furnished with the data, from which to judge at all in the case. There is, indeed, one recourse left, by which we may parry the question, namely, to say that we will form no judgment whatsoever of a man in this respect. But, then, we must remember that, on this ground, we can no more judge, or act, in favor of one's claim, than against it, and that we bind ourselves to universal and impartial indecision on the subject. For fear of committing an error, we abdicate our reason, — the sum total of all errors; as the man, in the fable, had his head cut off to prevent nose-bleed.

We would ask pardon for having introduced so tedious an array of suppositions, were it not that most of the cases, absurd as they seem at present, are such as would, nevertheless, actually come up before us for disposal, were the principle in question to be generally adopted; and, if adopted, we should find too many who would insist on its legitimate application, to render retreat altogether pleasant, or even practicable. There are so many motives, often unconscious motives, too, for availing oneself of the advantages of the Christian name, in Christian countries, that we may be pretty sure it will be claimed to the utmost given latitude; at least until it shall thus have been rendered wholly insignificant in the public estimation. Then, indeed, it will be ingenuously dispensed with, as a matter of no con-

Digitized by Google

sequence. We do not find that mere admirers of Mahomet, for instance, who yet are not believers in his divine mission, are quite so anxious to be called Mahometans, within the bounds of Christendom, as in Turkey; nor do we learn that any of the mere admirers of Christ, among the Turks, have pleaded for the right of being called Christians. It is not the fashion of the country. Nor would it be the fashion of this country, were no privileges attached to the name, here, more than there.

The cases supposed are such as, it was judged, would demonstrate, to the conviction of all, that some faith is absolutely requisite, in the nature of things, towards constituting one a Christian, — belief at least in God and in Jesus Christ. We think that no class of Christians can clearly and systematically define their own position, with reference to those examples, without finding themselves on this ground, even though they have been accustomed to disallow it, in general terms. If any, however, should deliberately conclude that neither Atheism, nor Polytheism, nor disbelief in the existence of Jesus Christ, is a bar to Christian fellowship, we admit that they would be beyond the reach of our illustrations. But with all who cannot go to that length, it becomes a fundamental principle, that faith is one of the elements indispensable in the case; and, of course, that it must be required, whatsoever consequences follow. The only question with them, on this point, will now be, How much, or what faith? It is in determining this, that we must guard, the best we can, against any dangers that may be incurred. And here we beg leave to remark, that, in settling this only remaining question, it would be out of place to bring any argument, or appeal, against the main principle itself; that is, unless we conclude to reject it, and to go back to the other position. We may be told, It is bigotry to refuse Christian fellowship on grounds merely of faith; it is the old illiberality; it is an attempt to suppress free inquiry; it is setting up our own opinions as the standard — the very essence of Popery; it is excluding men better than ourselves, &c. Well, then, what shall we do? take in the Atheist, or Deist, or avowed infidel, if he be only a good man? It is but reasonable that we decide on something, and that we decide by some principle, not by mere caprice. For our-

Digitized by Google

selves, we do not see that the allegations, just repeated, are true; but, suppose they are so, we must still act one way or the other, and take the consequences. Which shall it be?

We have been the more particular on this point, because, if we mistake not, here is the pivot on which the whole matter turns, and keeps turning, with many. Could they fix this immovably, there would be no great difficulty in the rest of the inquiry. But, if we begin by laying down a rule, in general terms, which we neither do, nor can, abide by; if we exclude such cases as are self-evidently inadmissible on account of faith, and exclude them for that reason, at the same time that we include other questionable cases by virtue only of the rule that none are to be rejected on account of faith,—it will, of course, be impossible to settle down on any principle, so long as we thus play backwards and forwards. Let us, first, "be fully persuaded, in our own minds," as to which ground we will abide by.

Before we pass from the question, whether any faith at all is absolutely requisite to the Christian character, we ought to appeal to the decision which we all receive as final, namely, the doctrine of Christ and his apostles, and especially of St. Paul, on this point. Now, according to the New Testament, do they teach that no faith, in particular truths, is essential, and that their religion is merely a life without regard to any belief, say, in God, in Jesus Christ, in his miracles, and resurrection? Or, do they, in the most peremptory language, require men to believe, and condemn them for not believing? We present the bare question, without the answer; trusting that the known fact, which lies out so broad on all the face of the New Testament, will be compared with the hypothesis under examination. No absurdity more glaring could be conceived, than a *Christian* religion without belief. Only imagine a New Testament re-written and exhausted of all the imperative requisitions of this kind, which at present form one of its leading features!

And now, having fully defined, and as we trust demonstrated, the principle that lies at the bottom of our subject, we shall be able to proceed with greater facility and expedition in what remains.

Digitized by Google

What faith is requisite towards constituting one a Christian, and of course towards authorizing Christian fellowship? There are two ways of obtaining an answer to this question: 1st, by the instructions we may find, upon it, in the Scriptures; 2dly, by the nature of the case.

According to the latter, we have already seen that there must be faith in Jesus Christ as an historical personage. How far? Nobody who acknowledges the position itself, but will at the same time acknowledge that Christ must be received as a moral pattern, and as a teacher of truth, at least in a general sense; that there must be faith in his general system of doctrine, to the same extent, at least, that we should have to believe in the principles of Plato's doctrine, in order to be truly Platonists. But the turning-point in this inquiry is with respect to the authority of Christ: Must one believe in his divine authority, as a teacher and example, in order to be a Christian? And here, to foreclose an evasion, let it be observed that we do not ask, whether we must believe in the authority of certain *truths* he taught, and of certain *virtues* he exemplified. Such a question would be inept; since all truth and all virtue, *when known to be such*, are in this sense authoritative, no matter who teaches them, nor whether they be taught at all. To this end, however, it is necessary not only that they should be presented to us, but that they should also appear to us to belong to these categories. We never feel the authority of any particular truth or virtue, farther than we recognize them as such. Nay, we always feel that there is authority in a falsehood, so long as we mistake it for a truth, and in a wrong if it seem to us right: "I verily thought that I *ought* to do many things contrary to the name of Jesus of Nazareth." In these cases, the authority, we mean that of which we are now speaking, does not lie in the particular proposition, or thing, that is true or false, but in the universal principle of truth, to which it is supposed to belong; and all we need, is to know whether it does belong to that principle. There are, indeed, some particular propositions, chiefly of the elementary kind, the truth of which is self-evident, so that they need only to be stated intelligibly, in order to carry conviction at once to every rational mind. But, then, Christianity is not of this class; for it has been stated to many a one, in terms that

Digitized by Google

were understood, and still it has been rejected, as in the case of the Jews who heard Christ himself. We admit, also, that some doctrines, not self-evidently true, may nevertheless harmonize so far with what we do know, or so far answer to the demands of our nature, as to derive a great degree of probability from these grounds. Indeed, every proposition, which is true, has its absolute demonstration somewhere abroad in its infinite relations with God, ourselves, and the Universe; and its truth would be manifest to us at once, were our reason not only pure from other elements, but also infinite, so that it took the whole into its survey. Till this be the case, however, it would be no less an absurdity in philosophy, than an error in fact, to say that all, which is true, carries its demonstration in itself to minds like ours. But let us return from this digression.

To be Christians, then, must we believe in the divine authority of Jesus Christ *himself?* Must we believe that he was commissioned and endowed, by God, in such a manner as that the fact of his teaching shall be to us a sufficient voucher of truth, even when the doctrine taught is not otherwise determined by our reason to be either true or false? Or, on the other hand, is it enough to believe in the teacher Christ, as I believe, say, in the teacher Plato; that is, to receive nothing on his *ipse dixit*, but to accept only such of his doctrines as I see are true in and of themselves, and to hold the rest in suspense, or to reject them, as the case may be? To us it seems that this would be enough, if the relation of Christ to Christians were of no other kind than that of Plato to Platonists, — merely as an explainer, an adviser, but neither infallible nor personally authoritative. In that case, both classes of disciples would be under the same natural obligation to sit in judgment on the instructions of their teachers; and they would have the same right, consistently too with their profession, to reject, or alter, the doctrines of their respective masters to any extent short of denying the leading principles of their systems. But if, in these respects, the relation between Christ and his followers, between Christianity and Christians, is fundamentally different from that of Platonists to their master and his doctrines, then it is but tautology to say, that no one who does not stand in that different and

Digitized by Google

peculiar relation is a Christian. Is it the fact, then, and indeed the central fact in Christianity, without which Christianity had not existed as a religion, that Christ was God's authoritative messenger to men, as Plato was not? If so, he must, from the very supposition itself, be received as such, in order to meet the essential requisitions of the case; just as I must receive a magistrate as authoritative within the sphere of his jurisdiction, in order to be truly his subject. What if we should say, We acknowledge the authority of no man, but only of such precepts and laws as we see to be naturally binding in and of themselves, come from whom they may, or from nobody; and, therefore, if our magistrate, or any one else, shall announce such, we will do them, but none the more for his announcing them, — should we thus reject him in his character of a magistrate, and deny that we were his subjects, or not? And so, in our relation to Christ. His divine authority underlies all his doctrines, vouches for them as the utterances of a higher wisdom than man's, and thus brings them to bear on the soul with all the reverential, subduing sense of God's immediate dictation. Argue as we may, there still is something in the idea of a *personal* God and of his *personal* sanction, that impresses our nature very differently than does the mere philosophical recognition of abstract moral qualities, and of their binding force. It is the difference between Theism and Atheism in our moral conscience. And now, if Christ's teachings were delivered to us under this peculiar sanction, — not as the fallible, or infallible hypotheses (have it either way,) of human reason, but as a direct revelation from God, they must be received as such, or their essential character is denied, — the very ground on which they were placed, and which gives them their special force, being disallowed. The fact of a revelation, we mean in the common sense of the term, presupposes that it is essential in the case; unless we conclude that God employed this extraordinary method unnecessarily, or at least that we can supersede it, as he could not, with the ordinary method. On this point, the spontaneous decision of human nature itself, was, in principle, long ago pronounced by the heathen poet: —

> "Nec Deus intersit, nisi dignus vindice nodus
> Inciderit."

Digitized by Google

It would be easy to show, that the peculiar distinction which mankind have always recognized, and indeed exemplified in the effects, between speculative and moral philosophy, on one hand, and religion on the other, is found in the idea of some interposition of Deity, by which he addresses his truth and his commands, to our intelligence, through a surer and more direct medium than the uncertain abstractions of human reason. And he who excludes this idea from Christianity, not only rejects the authority on which God saw fit to propose the religion to us objectively, but also reduces the whole, subjectively, from the character of a religion to that of a philosophy. He may still be a philosopher, and in other respects a good man; but he is not a Christian, because he does not stand in the relation which God constituted between Christ and his followers. This is the rule that grows out of the nature of the case.

We must observe, too, that whatsoever rule of this kind there be, it is universal, applying to all others just as it does to ourselves. It is not one over which we have any dispensing power, unless we can go back and alter the constitution of Christianity. Perhaps it will be said, We do, indeed, receive Christianity, for ourselves, on this ground, believing that the revelation and consequent authority are essential in the case; but still, must we set up our judgment of the matter as the standard for others? Without stopping here, to disentangle this question of some oblique bearings, we answer, to the only point now concerned, Certainly, we must use our judgment as the medium at least through which we judge of others, if we judge of them at all. There is no help for this. Suppose an avowed Atheist come to us and say, "I think myself a Christian, in my sense of the term; please to acknowledge me as such?" No, say we, for we believe that faith in God is essential to that character. "But," retorts he, "do you set up your judgment of the matter as the standard for me?" By no means, dear sir, but for ourselves. You will, of course, think and act according to the light you have; let us do the same. Be so good as not to set up your judgment as the standard by which we are to be governed in our views of your case; allow us to judge of you according to our light. "Yes," says he, "but what right have

Digitized by Google

you to judge of me at all?" Perhaps none, if you will not again ask us to do so.

We have now seen what answer is found in the nature of the case. Let us turn to the other method. Do the Scriptures decide our question, either by explicit definitions, or by any action which they record of Christ and his apostles in relation to this point? If so, their decision will be final with us, because we acknowledge their authority over ourselves, even though we should still doubt whether it is binding on others.

We trust it is unnecessary, with our readers, to prove that, according to the four Gospels, Christ professed to be the Messiah foretold by the prophets, the only begotten Son of God, who came forth from the Father in some way peculiar to himself, having authority immediately from God, as other men had not; that he always assumed to speak and act in the name of God, basing his doctrine on this ground; and that the people, both enemies and friends, understood him to claim this character. Nor can it be necessary to show that, while standing before the people only in this light, he required them to believe in him, as one of the conditions of discipleship. Now, does any one need to go farther than these indisputable facts, for an answer to our question? In demanding belief in himself, he of course demanded it in himself as the character that he professed to be, and not as some other character. The priests and Pharisees believed in him as a pretender; Herod believed in him as that revered teacher, John the Baptist, risen from the dead; Pilate, as a good man; but none of these believed in him truly. According to the nature of the case, he meant, and was understood, to demand that his claims, his authority from God, on which he grounded his ministry, should be recognized. If this argument, however, has been stated in too summary a form, to make its conclusiveness felt, let us trace it out a little way in detail. From the beginning of his ministry onward, what personal connection with God was attributed to him? The voice from heaven, at his baptism, announced, "This is my beloved Son, in whom I am well pleased." John the Baptist "saw and bare record that this is the Son of God." Andrew, on being called by Jesus, tells Simon, "We have found the Messiah;" and Philip, on the same occasion,

Digitized by Google

tells Nathaniel, "We have found him of whom Moses, in the law, and the prophets did write." Then Nathaniel, on meeting Christ, confesses, "Rabbi, thou art the Son of God; thou art the King of Israel." John the Baptist again declares of him, "He that cometh from heaven is above all; and what he hath seen and heard, that he testifieth, and no man receiveth his testimony. He that hath received his testimony, hath set to his seal that God is true; for he whom God hath sent, speaketh the words of God; for God giveth not the spirit by measure unto him. The Father loveth the Son, and hath given all things into his hand." Even Nicodemus admits, "We know that thou art a teacher come from God; for no man can do these miracles that thou doest, except God be with him." Christ says to him, "Verily, verily, I say unto thee, we speak that we do know, and testify that we have seen; and ye receive not our testimony. . . . And no man hath ascended up to heaven, but he that came down from heaven, even the Son of man which is in heaven." He approves Nathaniel's confession that he was the Son of God, the King of Israel, and adds, "Because I said unto thee, I saw thee under the fig-tree, believest thou? thou shalt see greater things than these. . . . . Verily, verily, I say unto you, Hereafter ye shall see heaven open, and the angels of God ascending and descending on the Son of man."—All this, in the outset of his public life, shows how commonly, even at that time, was it known what claims he assumed.—At subsequent stages of his ministry, the same thing is seen in the repeated declarations of the demoniacs, who must have spoken from common report. Nor did Christ ever hesitate to assert his claims, when he could do so without hazarding an insurrection of the people. The woman of Samaria "saith unto him, I know that Messias cometh, which is called Christ; when he cometh, he will tell us all things. Jesus saith unto her, I that speak unto thee, am he." Many of the Samaritans then came unto him, and "believed, because of his own words; and said unto the woman, Now we believe, not because of thy saying, for we have heard him ourselves, and know that this is indeed the Christ, the Saviour of the world." The only time he visited the remote parts of Cesarea Philippi, he asked his disciples, concerning the people there, "Who

Digitized by Google

do men say that I, the Son of man, am? And they said, some say that thou art John the Baptist, some Elias, and others Jeremias, or one of the prophets." None of these answers were satisfactory: "He saith unto them, But who say ye that I am? And Simon Peter answered and said, Thou art the Christ, the Son of the living God. And Jesus answered and said unto him, Blessed art thou, Simon Bar-jona, for flesh and blood hath not revealed it unto thee, but my Father which is in heaven. And I say also unto thee, that thou art Peter; and upon this Rock I will build my church, and the gates of Hades shall not prevail against it." Again: he tells the Jews, "Verily, verily, I say unto you, the Son can do nothing of himself, but what he seeth the Father do; for what things soever he doeth, these also doeth the Son likewise. . . . . The Father judgeth no man, but hath committed all judgment unto the Son, that all men should honor the Son even as they honor the Father. He that honoreth not the Son, honoreth not the Father which has sent him. . . . . For as the Father hath life in himself, so hath he given to the Son to have life in himself; and hath given him authority to execute judgment also, because he is the Son of man. . . . Had ye believed Moses, ye would have believed me; for he wrote of me." And so, onwards, to the end of his ministry. But we need not proceed with our quotations.

Such, then, was the character, and such the personal authority from God, which he claimed, and was commonly known to claim, to the exclusion of every other man. Under these circumstances, what must have been the belief that he so imperatively demanded? Belief in himself as what he claimed to be? or, as something else, — a sort of Herod-belief, or Pilate-belief, or Cesarea-Philippian belief, or whatsoever was respectful and favorable? To Nicodemus he says, "He that believeth on him [Christ,] is not condemned; but he that believeth not, is condemned already, *because he hath not believed in the name of the only begotten Son of God.*" When the people asked him, "What shall we do that we might work the works of God? Jesus answered and said unto them, This is the work of God, that ye believe on him *whom he hath sent*," — and we have already seen how much he meant by being "sent of God." To the Jews he said, "If ye believe not *that I am*

Digitized by Google

he, ye shall die in your sins. Then said they unto him, Who art thou? And Jesus saith unto them, Even the *same that I said unto you from the beginning.*" On another occasion, "came the Jews round about him, and said unto him, How long dost thou make us to doubt? If thou be the Christ, tell us plainly. Jesus answered them, *I told you*, and *ye believed not;* the works that I do, *in my Father's name*, they bear witness of me. But ye believe not, because ye are not of my sheep, as I said unto you." Let these few examples suffice to show what belief in himself he specifically pointed out. They will also suffice to preclude any plea, that the belief he demanded was not belief in himself personally, but in certain general principles.

We might proceed and show, by numerous examples, that what his disciples believed, was, that he was the Christ, the Son of God; that he came forth from God, was sent of God in a sense peculiar to himself; that he spoke and acted not of himself, but that the Father who dwelt in him performed the works. Belief in him is frequently identified, both by himself and by the evangelists, with belief in the miracles he wrought; and, after his resurrection, with belief in that event. He "upbraided the eleven with their unbelief and hardness of heart, *because they believed not them which had seen him after he was risen.*" We need not rehearse the instances in which Christ explicitly rested the proof of his character and divine authority, on the miraculous demonstrations of his ministry, and charged the Jews with blasphemy against the Holy Spirit for saying that they were effected by the aid of Beelzebub, and not by "the finger of God." We shall not, here, enter into the question, discussed in a former number of our work, whether they were the *highest* proof of Christ's authority from God; but whether, on the New Testament ground, they must be believed, and regarded as *a* proof, would seem to admit of no discussion. Suppose, now, that I had stood by Christ, when he appeared, say, after his resurrection, to his disciples in Galilee; and that I had said to him, Master, I believe in your speculative doctrines, or at least in the chief of them; not, however, because you teach them, but because I think them true on other grounds. No one, not even yourself any

Digitized by Google

more than another man, shall exercise authority over my belief. I also admire your general character, and especially your spirit towards God and men; I think it superior to any thing I ever saw or read of. I am trying to adopt it myself. But as to that kingdom you at first attempted to set up here,—it was a sad mistake, Master. You did well to turn the matter off, at last, and call it a sort of spiritual kingdom. And as to these foolish stories about your miracles, and of your having been put to death, and risen from the tomb, and all the pretensions to a peculiar divine mission and authority,—I understand the affair well enough. It will do for John and Peter, and the illiterate mass; but you and I see through it all. Whatever was real about it, was done by animal magnetism, and by roots and herbs! Now, we ask, would Christ have acknowledged me, on the grounds here specified, as one of his disciples? The whole tenor of the New Testament is too clear to require an answer. And if Christ would not have received such a person, we, who are bound by his example, cannot.

There are, indeed, many passages in the New Testament, which, if taken by themselves, and then interpreted as complete and scientific propositions, would seem to imply that nothing but moral virtue, or rather that only some one particular moral virtue, was requisite to the Christian; just as other texts, if treated in the same way, would teach the most extravagant Antinomianism. "Blessed are the peace-makers, for they shall be called the children of God." "Blessed are the poor in spirit; for theirs is the kingdom of heaven." "One thing thou lackest: Go thy way, sell whatsoever thou hast, and give to the poor, and thou shalt have treasure in heaven; and come, take up thy cross, and follow me." "All things whatsoever ye would that men should do unto you, do ye even so to them; for this is the law and the prophets." And so, in many other texts, parables, &c., some one virtue is designated as the ground of acceptance; and all this, too, in contradistinction to "faith without works." We hardly think, however, that this class of texts needs any labored explanation with one who is accustomed to regard the general tenor of the New Testament on any subject. It will readily occur to him that, sometimes, belief is insisted

Digitized by Google

on, literally to the seeming exclusion of all moral virtue; and, on other occasions, virtue, to the seeming disparagement of faith; and this will lead him to seek, in the peculiar circumstances and immediate object of each case, the reason why one element is now enforced, and now the other. At all events, he will not deliberately settle down in the absurdity of verifying both of the contrary extremes at once, that faith without works is all that is necessary, and also that works without faith is all that is necessary. Still, should the texts referred to, be adduced, in the natural eagerness of argumentation, as testimony against the principle we have illustrated, it will be sufficient just to press this one question, namely, What do we quote them for? Let us understand our own object: is it to prove that no belief whatsoever, say, in God, or in Jesus Christ, is necessary?—thus going back to a denial of the general principle itself, which we supposed, in the former part of this article, to be set at rest. And, then again, it is admitted that, according to the New Testament, Christ made it a rule to require belief in himself personally as the Messiah, the Son of God, &c., and to condemn those who would not thus believe. Now, is it our object to bring these texts against an acknowledged matter of fact, so as to make it seem that Christ did not require such faith? Let us only define what it is that we propose to do with them, and the absurdity of this extreme will be as apparent as that of the Antinomian. But let us return to the scriptural illustration of our subject.

We have seen what was Christ's practice in relation to it. If we look to the example of his apostles, whose authority likewise we acknowledge, we find that they admitted applicants for the Christian fellowship, only on profession of belief. We say, only in this way; for wherever the grounds are specified, this is the case. "See, here is water; what doth hinder me to be baptized?" said the Ethiopian, after Philip had "preached unto him Jesus." "And Philip said, If thou believest with all thine heart, thou mayest. And he answered and said, I believe that Jesus Christ is the Son of God."—"What must I do to be saved?" asked the jailor at Philippi; "Believe on the Lord Jesus Christ, and thou shalt be saved," was the answer of Paul and Silas. The Christians are always de-

Digitized by Google

signated as the "believers." St. Paul says, "If thou shalt confess with thy mouth the Lord Jesus, and shalt believe in thine heart that God hath raised him from the dead, thou shalt be saved." Would St. Paul, now, have received one, as a Christian, who did not believe that God had raised Christ from the dead? "If Christ be not risen," says he, with explicit reference to his visible reappearance, — "if Christ be not risen, then is our preaching vain, and your faith is also vain. Yea, and we are found false witnesses of God; because we have testified of God that he raised up Christ; whom he raised not up, if so be that the dead rise not." Take all the writings of the apostles, mark their general tenor; and then ask ourselves, whether they would have acknowledged any one, as a believer, who denied all the miraculous in Christ and Christianity. If they would not, we cannot; because we receive their rule as authoritative for our practice.

Such is the answer we find to our question, both in the Scriptures, and in the nature of the case. We think of but one more problem to be examined, in reference to our subject. We, indeed, believe in the authority of the New Testament, and consequently in the genuineness and demonstrative force of the miracles, as there recorded. But may not a man reject all this, and still arrive, by another way, to a firm conviction of the divine authority of Jesus Christ and of his teachings, — we mean in the scriptural sense of the expression? Suppose him a speculative philosopher, not a theologian; he sees in nature such a confirmation of the doctrines of Christ, and finds in his own moral consciousness such a harmony with them, as well as such an approval of the character presented as his, that he is persuaded they are true. So far, however, he has indeed reached only the stage of belief, which has been already sufficiently considered. But in addition to this, he now looks back through all history, with which he is, of course, thoroughly familiar, and perceives a continued miracle, a positive interposition of God, in the effects Christianity has wrought, and in the manner of its development; and this divine sanction of the cause, demonstrates to him that Christ was personally the authorized spokesman and representative of God, — we still mean in the sense in which he claimed to be. Is he not a Christian now, though he

Digitized by Google

reject the New Testament account, and all the particular miracles? To this question there are two answers. 1. We may be allowed to wait till such a phenomenon, as here described, appears in real life, before we take the otherwise unnecessary pains to analyze the case, and to ascertain precisely its value. For, by the very terms of the proposition, the man is supposed to believe the absolute authority of Christ himself, just as the Scriptures present it; and we have neither read nor heard of one who pretended to have arrived at *this* conviction through the method specified. We would observe, here, that a careful thinker will be in no danger of confounding this case with that of one who already believes in such authority of Christ on scriptural grounds, and then sees it illustrated and confirmed through other mediums. But, 2, if all which is meant is, that the man regards Christ as having only such an authority, in kind, as all teachers of truth and patterns of virtue possess, though greater in degree, the question comes under the head which we have already discussed and answered to the best of our ability.

Here we close the direct examination. Should it be feared that the conclusions to which we have been brought, are likely to be abused to the indulgence of illiberality, we would suggest that the danger does not lie in the calling of things by their right names, but in a wrong spirit towards the things themselves after they are called by their right names. We may be very illiberal in our treatment of one whom we acknowledge to be a Christian; and we may be perfectly liberal in our relations with those whom we do not regard as Christians. If an otherwise good man is, in point of fact, not a believer, in the New Testament sense of the term, we ought to say so frankly; and then, if he suffers unjustly, on *that* account, it is, of course, because there is an unjust odium against the name that properly belongs to him, be it sceptic, Deist, or Atheist; and our duty is to remove that undue prejudice, not to violate truth, by striving to shelter him under a false appellation. It is the most inconsistent, and even puerile, of all kinds of illiberality, to be indifferent with respect to the thing itself, and bigoted against the name, — like the unwise advocate of negro-rights, who seriously contended that

Digitized by Google

negroes should be called white men, in order to save them from an odious name, which he himself treated as contemptuously as others.

The motive, with many, in denying the necessity of faith, is, probably, to put a stop to the contentions of Christians, and to prevent the abuses of bigotry. Only establish the rule, that no man's faith is to be regarded; and will not that do away with all bickerings and exclusiveness? It may be well to consider, here, that if the rule is, in itself, absurd, it can only aggravate these evils in the result, by the inconsistencies in which it will perpetually involve us, and by the consequent subterfuges, unworthy and vexatious, to which it will force us. Desirable as the object is, we cannot think that this is the way to attain it. Besides, do we suppose that a tyrannical temper, a spirit of clan, a party-zeal, or an aristocratical disposition, cannot with all ease find other grounds to harass or exclude? Which is better, to let these elements exhaust themselves in picking flaws in one's faith, or in aspersing one's moral and religious character? We do not read ecclesiastical history aright, nor do we see passing events in their true aspect, if the latter of these practices has not always been resorted to, when the other failed, and there was still a heart for the work. If the object, however, be, to relieve men, not only from persecution and unjust odium, but also from all disadvantageous relations, on account of a pernicious faith, or of no religious faith at all, there is but one way, in the very nature of things, to reach it, namely, to make the community feel that religious truth and error, of every kind, are matters of perfect indifference. Then people will act accordingly. But so long as they feel that there is any value in faith, or belief, they will guard it with a care proportionate to the importance they attach to it; and they will also look with a corresponding degree of cautiousness at least, on every one who impugns it. Say, if we please, that this is all wrong; but there is no help for it, short of disenchanting men of respect for truth.

Perhaps it will be said, We would remove all attachment to particular doctrines, in order to set the human intellect at perfect liberty for new inquiries, unbiassed and unimpeded by any fixed opinions. If we would promote the discovery of truth, and the consequent progress of our

Digitized by Google

race, why fetter the public mind with any forms of faith? why place guards over its opinions? why not let it go forth free as air? Doubtless, freedom of thought is of the highest importance, — we mean true freedom, that is subject to the laws of conscience and reason, and that is thus distinguished from anarchy. But if we seek to promote it, by impairing our regard, veneration, and sense of sacredness, for what appears true to us, do we expect to give any powerful impulse to the desire for truth, or to its discovery? In this way, we may, indeed, cherish a love of novelty, a rage for crude and wild fancies, a boundless and mad caprice; but the patient, laborious, exhaustive process of investigation is not aided by such habits. This dissolution of all attachment to systems of faith, this holding of the public mind in suspense or indifference with respect to objective doctrines, ready to shift at every impulse of the moment, — this is not the state in which men can exist, while they retain any settled belief, or love of truth; nor would its advantages, on other accounts, be so great as to make it desirable. A certain degree of inertia is as necessary, as mobility, to the accomplishment of any enterprise, though it may at times occasion inconvenience. According to the Rabbinic fable, Jezruel, the mightiest of archangels, once took compassion on the children of men, when he saw how they were sorely straightened, in their doings, by the solidity of matter. They wore themselves out, in digging the hard ground, in hewing timber and cutting rocks, and still made but very slow progress. Often were they pierced through with spears, torn by thorns, mangled by hooks and sharp points, and falling weights, and sometimes crushed to death. Whereupon Jezruel said, In the Name Unutterable! I will deliver the children of men from this great evil; and, at his word, the earth and all things thereon were forthwith dissolved into impalpable gas. And all the angels, who were set over this world, cried Amen, Amen! and rejoiced with exceeding great joy. And they said, Now let man go forth, and labor without hinderance, and with great progress. But they were sorely astonished, when they looked, and behold! there was no foot-hold left for man; all his implements of labor were dissolved with the rest, and he himself was seen floating upwards, even as a thin vapor, far away towards the new moon. Then said they quickly

Digitized by Google

to Jezruel, If our Lord would but even now have compassion, a second time, on the race of Adam, and restore all things! Peradventure, the children of men will live again, and return to their labor. And it was so. There are, perhaps, periods in moral and religious history, corresponding in some degree with the great geological periods, in which the former systems of faith and practice are dissolved into a temporary chaos. But it is to be observed, that so long as the dissolution continues, there is nothing better to take the place of the old formulas. It is, in itself, an epoch of mere destruction, though preparatory to new formations, which appear afterwards, and then but slowly. Never need we engage in the suicidal attempt to bring on the chaos. It will come, if necessary, as death comes, in the regular process of nature. In the ordinary course of divine Providence, reforms and improvements in faith and practice are accomplished, with much commotion indeed on the surface, but without upheaving the substratum. They are elaborated out of principles already recognized, and by means that have been fashioned in the existing state of things, so that the processes of destruction and renovation go along together. It would be but a sad state of things, here, were Jezruel to hold us in permanent solution, lest there should be obstacles to progress.

We may be asked, Why this timid cautiousness? Even though all existing forms of faith, and doctrines of religion should be, for a while, thrown into confusion, will not truth, whatsoever it prove to be, triumph in the end? Shall we be afraid of injuring the truth? 'Alas, no! but of injuring ourselves and others,' was the man's reply to the abstractionist who urged him to pull the rock over on himself and his company, by way of experiment—'What are you afraid of? of injuring the law of gravitation?' inquired he. It is no distrust of the force of truth, to believe it capable of working its way through all the obstacles of ignorance, error and bigotry, and at the same time of avenging on its professors any unfaithfulness or neglect to maintain it. Not by waiting till all difficulties are removed from the field, does truth work out its conquests; but by meeting them, face to face, and overcoming them.

We cannot suppress the conviction that of all evils which may befall a people, the loss of settled and definite

Digitized by Google

faith, is one of the greatest. It is attended not only by confusion without, but by desolateness within. The little compact world of principles in which we live and move, as on sure ground, is exploded into atoms; the central point is taken away, on which we are self-balanced over the infinite abyss that looms on every hand around us, whenever we turn our eyes in that direction. With these views, we cannot but regard all attempts to confound the idea of divine revelation by ambiguous words, as an evil that justifies some anxiety, — not for the safety of God's eternal truth, as we repeat, but for the safety of ourselves and of our fellow-men. On those who sympathize with us, in these convictions, the duty seems imperative to "contend earnestly for the faith which was once delivered to the saints," and to be as decided, at least, in maintaining, clear and distinct, the authority of the "one Mediator between God and men," as others in detracting from it. We hope this may be done with all charity, and with all justice to the virtues of individuals; but it is neither charity nor justice, it is weakness, for Christians themselves to lend a helping hand in obliterating the distinction between Christian faith and scepticism, in order to accommodate any one with a sanction to which he is not entitled.

Even they who differ from our views, will not deny that the matter is one of incalculable moment. Of course, we have no wish to dissuade them from acting out their deliberate convictions of truth; but we trust they will feel the responsibility of the movement, so far as not to act till after the most thorough examination and mature knowledge of the subject. As reasonable men, they will doubtless bring the question home, point-blank, to themselves, Are we quite ready, as yet, to take our stand on the rule that no belief is necessary to Christianity? for when we have once established this rule, it is folly to warn people against applying it *ad libitum*. Have we anticipated, and seriously weighed, the consequences, to religion, of sweeping away all distinctions between belief and unbelief? of pronouncing Atheists, and sceptics, and Deists, to be Christians? Do we see the way perfectly clear through all the dilemmas with which this most enormous of paradoxes is beset? And are we, just now, prepared to shift the whole system of Christianity off from the New Testa-

Digitized by Google

ment ground, over to the floating hypotheses of mere abstract speculation? hypotheses, too, which are themselves but doubtful, to say the least, and which apparently belong to a class that we have, several times, seen, within the last half century, dissolve like the baseless fabric of a vision. If we have really examined the whole, step by step, and traced out all its conceivable bearings, and ascertained that there are no absurdities in the way, then let us indeed go forward; but let us be aware what we are about to do, — to upheave the very substratum on which the gospel has hitherto stood from the day that Christ began to preach. If we are sure, however, that truth demands the explosion, let it come. After two or three generations of huge, portentous monstrosities, and ever-shifting phantasmagoria playing over the turbulent chaos, the elements will doubtless settle down again into system; though we, of course, cannot now anticipate what that system will be. But if there be any reasonable doubt with respect to our new hypothesis, — if we have not, as yet, thoroughly developed it in our own minds, nor seen all its apparent difficulties cleared away, is it not well to pause, and reconsider the matter on both sides? Do not let us, in a case of such moment, boldly advocate, as fundamental principles, the opinions which we have not yet thoroughly proved, and which we are conscious have not yet passed from their crude state, even in our own minds. If we act rashly, here, we must not blame others for doing the same in carrying out the movement we begin.

As to the alleged necessity of striking out all belief from the conditions of Christian fellowship, the proposition itself seems suspicious on the face of it, since it is one-sided to the very utmost extreme. Because people have sadly erred in determining what is essential to the Christian faith, must we take the ground that nothing of the kind is essential? Because there is danger that we shall misjudge the requisites in the case, if allowed to exercise our reason upon it, must we abnegate our reason? This would be the same in principle, as to deny people the use of the Scriptures, lest they should misinterpret them. It is remarkable, how the contrary extremes of bigotry and latitudinarianism come around to the same point at last. For ourselves, we cannot discover any other difficulty in

Digitized by Google

this case, than is found in all questions of practical life. God does not allow us to throw off the responsibility of exercising the rational powers he has given us, and of judging for ourselves. We may indeed mistake, in a thousand points, of great importance both to ourselves and others; but it would be a still greater mistake to seek a remedy in universal indecision and indifference.

When we began this article, we designed to address a few considerations, at the close, to one of our Christian denominations, which exerts a much greater and wider influence, than is commonly supposed, on the course of religious thought in this country, and especially in the so called liberal sects. But as we approach the task, we cannot but feel that it might appear assuming, or at least too forward, in us. We will only say, in general terms, and with general reference, that the greater the influence of any body of Christians, and the more they are contributing to shape the destiny of others as well as of themselves, the more important is it that they be perfectly explicit and decided on all questions that involve the foundations of Christianity. The stand which they take, on these points, affects a wide circle; and a proportionate responsibility rests upon them, before God and the world.

H. B. 2d.

Art. XXVII.

1. *God's Temple.*

"Rise, and measure the temple of God, and the altar, and them that worship therein."
Rev. xi. 1.

See that the parts fit aptly, and the whole
Rises in solemn majesty, whereon
The early light may fall. From pole to pole,
In its far journey may it glance upon
No fairer temple to the living One,
Whose eye, more dazzling than the mid-day sun,
No mortal eye can brook. O send thy smile,
Father, upon the consecrated pile.

Digitized by Google

Within, the altar stands, whereon are laid
  Fruits of the Spirit — buoyant faith and prayer,
Hope that alone on love divine is stayed,
  Calm Resignation that hath fled despair.
Meek-eyed Submission, gathering from the dust
Her scattered jewels, soiled, and dimmed, and crushed,
Lays them upon the shrine with chastened heart,
And finds a blessing ere its feet depart.

O, who but God can read the mystic scroll
  Of the soul's history! that strange, vast theme
Of chequered being, round which shadows roll,
  Broken by many a fitful, dazzling gleam;
Unread, unmeasured, save by God alone,
To whom what height or depth remains unknown?
The human heart must throb its little day,
Then pass in silence from the world away.

Father, the noblest temple built by hands,
  Is but a grain of dust, before thy sight,
Compared to that which undivided stands —
  All space — the Universe — filled with thy light!
Our altars, — O, how humble, unto Thee,
Whose eye can count the stars and search the sea, —
Must these appear! But wilt thou not approve
The offering on them — hearts baptized in love?

H. J. W.

---

2. *The Joy of Sadness.*

O, yes, 'tis very beautiful, where in yon rosy west,
The weary sun is sinking, 'mong the golden clouds to rest;
And beautiful the light that falls among the dark glades here,
Like hopes of heaven that light the soul 'mid earthly gloom and fear.

And pleasantly, as here among the sweet wild flowers I lie,
Falls on my ear the tinkle of the runnel rippling by,
A tiny bass the wild bee lends, as humming home he flies,
Like weary traveller's carol as his cottage meets his eyes.

Yes, full of pleasant sounds this earth, and sights of beauty rare,
Yet from my heart a sadness falls o'er all this scene so fair;
The brook, the glades, the clouds, the flowers, are lovely all, I know,
But then, I turn from them above, to think what rests below.

The fond, fond brother-hearts, who used of old to drink with me
The golden spirit of delight, suffusing all we see, —
The gentle hearts, that throbbed around my blessed early day,
Now, hushed and low, how silently in dust ye waste away!

Digitized by Google

And thus around the brightest scenes this sunny earth can show,
Doth Memory to my tearful eyes, a haze of sadness throw;
Yet lovelier, holier they become, beheld through mist and shade,—
As heaven grows dearer to the soul, through clouds of grief surveyed.

For sorrowfully as I gaze, fond faces glimmer round,
Not soiled and ghastly with the dust that heaps their burial mound,
But calm and pure,—with hues of heaven faith limns their features fair,
And smiles of peace immortal those beloved faces wear.

Regret, 'tis true, with troubled eye, still views them as of old,
Ere Death abruptly hid them in the grave's invidious mould;
But Christian Faith, than sad Regret, or Death, much mightier far,
Consoles for all the past, revealing what and where they are.

And O, those smiles, serene and soft,—like light from Mercy's throne,
Make brighter, in my soul, the faith it fondly rests upon;
Saints ye have read—those smiles attest—in Man's Redeemer's face,
God yet shall trample Death to death, and grasp mankind in grace!

Then deem not, friend, though quietly amid this scene I lie,
And common pleasure stirs me not, I therefore naught enjoy;
As God's own heaven would shudder at the intrusive laugh of sin,
At earthly mirth would jar my peace, my Paradise within.

A. G. L.

Art. XXVIII.

Death and its Agencies.

Does this life affect the future? As are our views of death and its agencies, so will our answer be to this question. The theme is worthy of a most serious discussion. Turn as we will, death is the shadow of life. It is one of the unalterable ordinances of Heaven which involves our entire race, and no wit or skill can evade the condition to which it will reduce us. The body we inhabit may be crushed or shattered in a moment; destroyed by acute disease, or wasted by sickness; or if exempt from these, it must inevitably be dissolved by the decay of old age. There is no elixir whose subtile and preserving qualities can impart immortality to the frame-work of the soul's earthly dwelling; and were it to be had, he would not

Digitized by Google

be wise who should covet it. The pressure is upon us, and down the declivity we must go. On sound the waves of being, and on they must roll, placidly or tumultuously, as stream, lake, or river, till they reach the fall of death, and are hidden from mortal sight. What effect has that fall? Some scorn to give a patient reply, and sneer at the very thought of any change reaching them there; but others find cause for reverential gratitude to God for the visioned glories that faith presents, faintly typified by those mythological fables which dazzled the imagination with the transformations of beauty. To some, death is a mere physical event, entirely unimportant, and hardly to be coupled with the shedding of the milk-teeth in the infant; but to others,

> "Life makes the soul dependent on the dust;
> Death gives her wings to mount above the spheres;
> Through chinks, styled organs, life peeps out at light;
> Death bursts the involving cloud, and all is day;
> All eye, all ear, the disembodied power."

It is written of the Saviour, that he "hath *abolished* death;" but in what sense are we to understand this record? Death still hath power, and the shroud, the coffin, and the tomb, are awfully prominent in the imagination of the many. Death is abolished only as the record intimates, by the bringing of "life and immortality to light," by the clear revelation of a future existence, and that the prerogative of that life is immortality. To him who has received that revelation in its full glory, death doth not exist in any of those forms which the imaginings of men have given to it, while ignorance, fear and superstition dealt with the mysteries of human life. It is changed from being "the king of terrors," to a humane and wise ordination. It is seen to be a destroyer only that it may be a redeemer; and illustrations of the extent of this meaning, can be taken from those instances where, in the animal world, the vital principle takes to itself a new form of life, and becomes a being of the air instead of a grovelling worm.

The views which we hear advocated concerning death and its agencies, in various circles, may be classed under five heads, and it may be well to arrange our discussion by these divisions: 1. This is our all of life; our career,

Digitized by Google

as individuals, ends with the grave; 2. Death dissolves entirely our relations to the present life, and we are re-created for the enjoyment of a sinless existence; 3. The event of death is a mere transition from one state to another, comparable to a voyage or a journey from one portion of the globe to another; 4. According to the bent of the mind, or the moral character of the individual at death, will be a propelling force by which he shall perpetually progress in holiness and happiness, or sinfulness and misery; and, 5. Death is a mighty epoch in man's existence, freeing him from a perishable and ignoble body, and introducing him to new intellectual and moral relations, designed of God for the perfection of all his offspring. As the last is the only view which accords with the sublime prophecy of death being "swallowed up in victory," and can alone harmonize with the rapturous exultation of the inspired apostle over the glory which rises amid the ruins of the grave, we adopt that view as our own, and most sincerely would advocate its reasonableness and scriptural authority.

And, first, of that dark view of the limit of human life that measures out to us but a very brief existence. The grave is the end of our being. Love, as she bleeds over the cold ashes, weeps over the all of that being who was once so full of thought and feeling, who could utter his ideas in words or works, and give new energy to a vast range of mind, new philanthropy to a million of hearts, and inspire the loftiest courage and endurance by appeals to the yearning for immortality. All that have lived, and who no longer act in visible relation to the world around us, have now no being. Thought stopped forever with the beating of the heart, and affection became as pulseless as the chilled streams in the veins and arteries of the motionless body. All, from Adam to the last child that drew the soft fringe over the glassy eye, have ceased to exist, and as they are we shall soon be. All the reasonings and seeming intuitions that have intimated a future life, are but fancies that pleased only as the glittering dew-drop seemed a diamond; and neither on the earth, nor in any portion of the great universe, did ever a single soul reappear in individual life, in proper personality, after the change which in common speech is called death. The *species* survives, but the

Digitized by Google

individuals perish. Horrible to anticipate, even though with

> "The first dark day of nothingness,"

we couple

> "The last of danger and distress."

But there is one fact which stands out in eloquent prominence to refute this view of death, and that is, there is no destruction of the individual, be it animal, plant or tree, where the perpetual growth of the same would be good or a blessing. What is the loss of the individual in the species, in the whole of the round of nature with the exception of man, compared with the loss of man's personality in the race? The grain of corn is sown, and it produces many grains; the individual grain is lost in the multitude, it no longer has a separate existence, and we bless God for "seed to the sower and bread to the eater" derived therefrom. But where is there a glimpse of like wisdom, or the slightest analogy, in such a death of the individual man? The death of mind has no such fruitfulness; its fruitfulness can only be brought forth by a preservation of its strict identity; and, under the control of Him who grants but a brief time to the plant or tree to arrive at perfection, the everlasting growth of mind, the endless increase of thought in the individual soul, can contribute to the enlargement of man's sphere of action and the manifestation of his Creator's glory. The progress of the sciences, the achievements of the arts, and all the discoveries and inventions of adventurous and ingenious man, have not yet placed any limit to the individual mind, but the more the intellect achieves, the more we expect from its advances. In none of the changes or transformations in nature, is there any thing to intimate in the least such an utter perishing of force and fruitfulness as is involved in the monstrous idea of death having an agency to end our individual being.

We can hardly feel inclined to make any distinction between the idea of the destruction of our being at death and the idea of a re-creation, a loss of all memory of this life, a transmigration without any remembrance of the where or what. The poets have indulged a melancholy idea of our present life, that

Digitized by Google

> "Our birth is but a sleep and a forgetting;
> The soul that rises with us, our life's Star,
> Hath had elsewhere its setting."

We call it a melancholy idea, because it haunts the soul that indulges it with the mysteries of its former being, without the slightest aid to form one thought of the character of that forgotten life. It is true that

> "Not in entire forgetfulness,
> And not in utter nakedness,
> . . . . . do we come
> From *God*, who is our home;"

but to come from God, and to have had an existence prior to our birth into this world, are separate matters. We were born to look forward and not backward, not to ruins behind us, but to the fabric to be built from the materials bountifully furnished of Heaven. But less than the poet's idea, is the dream of those who speak of the future state as totally separated from the present — man having no memory there of what he was here — all minds fused together, and from the mass individuals created, all equal and alike, as so many globules of quicksilver when a mass of it is poured out upon a floor. This idea gives too little consequence to this life, makes it without meaning, and denies the potency of those consolations which appeal to the individual heart in reference to its individual loves. It says to the bereaved, "He knows nothing of you, and soon you will know nothing of him; wait patiently a little while, and all will be over!" What is this but virtual annihilation? It finds no countenance in the resurrection of Him whose first revelation of himself was by the utterance of a name, *Mary!* and were it countenanced at all by the Saviour, how easily and effectually might he have answered the Sadducees' question, by stating that the woman and her seven husbands would not possess the slightest memory of each other, or of this life, in the immortal state. This view is opposed by the plainest references to the future life in the Scriptures, as where it is said, "Women received their dead raised to life again: and others were tortured, not accepting deliverance, that they might obtain a better resurrection." Heb. xi. 35. Faith looked forward to a resurrection of the identical beings, or personalities, in the "bet-

Digitized by Google

ter resurrection," as truly as, when women received their dead raised to life again, they received the identical beings over whose cold sleep they had wept, like the Shunamite whose language of confident trust is now the speech of Christian assurance, "It is well!" "Thy *brother* shall rise again," said Jesus to Martha, and by that well chosen word, his compassionate spirit touched the most sensitive chord of the heart, whose vibration was the electric thrill of rapturous joy. How touchingly did he keep in view individual relationship and love, when he gave his first command after his resurrection, to tell his resurrection to the disciples *and Peter*, — that Peter who needed most of all a particular remembrance, and who reciprocated the affection by dashing into the sea to embrace his Lord, while the others waited the tardier passage of a boat to the opposite shore. The view now under discussion denies human immortality, for a re-creation is not, and cannot be made to be, synonymous with that continuity of existence which is necessarily implied in the idea of immortality.

We come then to the view of death which presents the idea of a mere transition from one state of existence to another, comparable to a voyage or a journey. The scriptural image of *sleep* is chosen, not in order to bring out to view the recuperative influence of repose, that twines muscle and nerve together in renewed strength and vigor, but to set forth the slightness of the change which is to be looked for at death; the sleep of a night from which we "rise to business, to pleasure, or ambition," the same in all respects as we were when we yielded ourselves to the repose of the night. Even the disciples of old had a better idea of sleep when they answered Jesus after he had spoken of Lazarus of Bethany, "Lord, if he sleep, he shall do well." A night's sleep hath restored the maniac to perfect soundness; has bidden the fever to abate its fury, and brought back hope and joy, and proved itself full oft "nature's soft nurse:" What eloquent names have been given to sleep, worthy of being kept in view by those who, in order to select an image that means little, mistakingly choose *sleep*, "tired nature's sweet restorer, balmy sleep," — "sore labor's bath, balm of hurt minds, great nature's second course, chief nourisher in life's feast," — "the poor man's wealth, the prisoner's release."

Digitized by Google

But who thinks of talking of death as we talk of sleep, when polemics are set aside?—death, that dissolves all the organs which the soul now employs, and places the spirit in many new relations to the universe and God. This is treating the matter too lightly; for if there is any thing plain in the Scriptures, it is the fact of the prominence given to the agency of death, through the fear of which men were, and are, "all their lifetime subject to bondage." Its name is used to sum up all evil, "the wages of sin is death;" and the graphic description of the spiritual state of darkened Israel when the Saviour came, was a sitting "in the region and shadow of death." The image turns us to the reality, and only by the severest violence to the Scriptures can it be asserted that death has an agency only to remove us from one state to another, in no other sense than as we fall asleep and awake to the same scenes, appetites, passions, sympathies, and affections.

But those who thus treat of death, and dogmatically ask us what effect is exerted upon the moral character by a journey to a distant part of the country, or a voyage to Europe, are unmindful of the influences of outward circumstances, and of their moulding effects upon character—the attention paid to this in our judgment of human actions, and in the education or discipline of children. The wit of man has not yet solved the problem respecting the reciprocal influence of circumstances on man, and of man on circumstances. The glory of mind is proclaimed. The victorious energies revealed in the heroic are applauded; and Poetry, lifting herself to "the highest heaven of invention," bursts forth in ectasy,—

> "Mind, mind alone, bear witness earth and heaven!
> The living fountain, in itself contains
> Of beauteous and sublime. There hand in hand
> Sit paramount the graces; there enthroned,
> Celestial beings, with divinest airs,
> Invite the soul to never fading joys."

Others differ from these enthusiasts. They look calmly on the outward as well as the inward; they note not only the purity of the waters of the mountain-stream, but also the channels through which they must inevitably flow, and see how here and there the fulness of the stream keeps itself pure, but at other points of view the soil impregnates

Digitized by Google

the waters with its own hues. They see mind encompassed with circumstances that necessarily give such forms, to its manifestations, as seemingly to furnish proof enough that while, on the one hand, it is worthy of God as its father, yet on the other, its parentage must be attributed to some purely evil power. To know a people, we must not only acquaint ourselves with history, but also with geography. The hardy mountaineers are not as the inhabitants of the valley, nor are the quiet pastoral people like the dwellers by the sea. It is not the transition from place to place that affects the character, but the irresistible influence of circumstances. Why do we plead, for attention to horticulture, the ornamental arts, taste, the love of the beautiful, neatness, order, in a community, on the ground of their effect in winning, insensibly to themselves, the indifferent over to the exercise of more care and regard to healthy appearances? We thus plead, because we know the power of the appeals made to the mind through the senses. There are involuntary sympathies that reach home to our moral being in social life, which make us the creatures of habit and society, — that make man, in one portion of our country, a different being from what he would be in another, and far different in other countries than in any part of our own. Whence the love of country, which is such a general trait in the character of man? Why are we particularly cautioned against following a multitude to do evil, but because there are powerful influences in being with a mass of persons? and why pray daily not to be led into temptation, but from a recognition of the pressure of circumstances that draw us into evil, ere we are aware of the force of the current around us? Why is the great lesson of charity always taught us, by the fact of the difficulty of separating sin from frailty, and deciding whether censure or pity should be bestowed on the fallen? As we were lately passing through a filthy portion of a city, and saw some hideous forms of humanity, we could not but let a thought have utterance, "There is a great deal of wickedness that comes from bad air." And we thought of "the mad poet," whose idea of heaven embraced, as one of the greatest attractions, "plenty of pure air." How have circumstances of a mere outward character been made to act on the insane, taming the wildest to docility,

Digitized by Google

and bringing peace to the despairing! It was not the mere transportation to those circumstances that affected them, though such a journey or voyage has done wonders; but the sanatary effects were produced by the subtile influence of circumstances that "strike the electric chain wherewith we are darkly bound." Channing has said, "The idea that by dying, or changing worlds, a man may be made better or virtuous, shows an ignorance of the nature of moral goodness or virtue." And why? because, as he answers, "This belongs to free beings; it supposes moral liberty. A man cannot be made virtuous, as an instrument may be put in tune, by a foreign hand, by an outward force. Virtue is that to which the man himself contributes. It is the fruit of exertion. It supposes conquest of temptation." Then, there must be *temptation* hereafter, in order for any one to obtain virtue, to advance in moral excellence. But that this "changing worlds" amounted to more in his own estimation than is implied in the above quotation, is evident from his argument against those who made man "half brute and half devil." He allowed that the brute or animal appetite is indeed strong in human beings; but he also asked, "Is it not rather an accident, the result of the mind's union with matter? Is not its spring in the body, and may it not be expected to perish with the body?" Let a due estimate be made of the force exerted by this brute or animal appetite, "animal propensities;" then consider the destruction of this spring, in the death of the body, and certainly a change will be discerned, by changing worlds, very *favorable* to virtue, to the fixed and active *choice* of that which is good. How is it now with reference to the reformed? those who are required to be "jealous of that evil nature, the power of which must be resisted, but from the besetting presence of which we shall not be conclusively delivered, until death shall rid us of a frame-work, the moral virus of which may be kept in check while we live, but cannot be eradicated by any process, short of dissolution." [Chalmers.] Do we not see heroic effort baffled, and a towering moral ambition brought low, by the sudden and tremendous activity of the animal appetite, the rushing, as it were, of a wild fire through the veins, maddening the whole being for a while? Hear the stirring eloquence of the reformed ine-

Digitized by Google

briate. Hear him tell how there come times when he feels strong as a giant to resist the workings of all temptation, and how again there are conditions of moral and physical being, when the slightest odor of inebriating or stimulating spirits exerts an almost irresistible influence. He feels like a wearied traveller suspended over a precipice, from which his slight grasp must soon be inevitably loosened. No journey or voyage can eradicate this "moral virus" from his system; but the resurrection can. Allow man his moral freedom, his power of choice, and define virtue as "the fruit of his own exertion;" and yet the argument is plain that death hath mighty agencies to favor virtue and open new paths of progress to the soul. How different must the inebriate be who bears the memory of his sin into the future state, and leaves here the "moral virus" that has worked more successfully in him than in some others! What moral purpose can be effected by that memory, but to heighten his gratitude to God for the change of worlds that has freed him from that brute appetite, and to serve as a contrast to those excellences of character to which he is called? Memory is the guardian of identity; but it should be remembered that if in "changing worlds" superior means of discerning the wisdom of God, in permitting evil, are not given, none can be happy. Babbage has shown this very conclusively, in one chapter, in his "Ninth Bridgewater Treatise," wherein he treats of the painful memory of departed folly, and that those, whom the world least accuses, accuse themselves the most. "Make but the offender better, and he is already severely punished. Memory recalls the existence of the past to a mind now imbued with finer feelings, with sterner notions of justice than when it enacted the deeds thus punished by their recollection." Memory brings up also traits of character in others which were unappreciated, opportunities of being useful which were slighted, and a thousand aids to redouble the force of accusing conscience. "It seems, then, that, either with improved faculties or with increased knowledge, we could scarcely look back with any satisfaction on our past lives; that to the major part of our race, oblivion would be the greatest boon. But if, in a future state, we could turn from the contemplation of our own imperfections, and with increased powers apply our minds to

Digitized by Google

the discovery of nature's laws, and to the invention of new methods by which our faculties might be aided in that research, pleasure the most unalloyed would await us at every stage of our progress. Unclogged by the dull corporeal load of matter which tyrannized over our most intellectual moments, and chained the ardent spirit to its unkindred clay, we should advance in the pursuit, stimulated instead of wearied by our past exertions, and encountering each new difficulty in the inquiry, with the accumulated power derived from the experience of the past, and the irresistible energy resulting from the confidence of ultimate success. Whether, then, we regard our future prospects as connected with a far higher acuteness of our present senses, — or as purified by more exalted moral feelings — or, as guided by intellectual power surpassing all we contemplate upon earth, — we equally arrive at the conclusion, that the mere employment of such enlarged faculties, in surveying our past existence, will be an ample punishment for all our errors; whilst, on the other hand, if that Being who assigned to us those faculties, should turn their application from the survey of the past, to the inquiry into the present, and to the search into the future, the most enduring happiness would arise from the most inexhaustible source." Here is *philosophy* for those who delight in such reasoning, and in this instance where its conclusions aid us in seeing more the beneficence of God in not imputing to the world their trespasses in the great reconciliation, we cannot but be thankful for its light. A grace must meet the redeemed, like that which was expressed by Joseph towards those brethren, in whom remorseful memory was busy, or there will be no peace to any soul. A change of worlds, the voyage across the Jordan of death, will indeed be equal to the journey of the twelve brethren into Egypt; the transition from land to land was not much, but what they met there was mighty in its moral effects. A greater than Joseph lives, and reigns on a mightier throne than that of the Pharaohs.

The next view of death and its agencies, is that which represents the change of worlds as the decisive time which fixes the bent of character; from which time the soul is bent upon good or evil, as the character may be, and enjoys or suffers accordingly. This was Channing's decision,

Digitized by Google

notwithstanding he so strongly and eloquently contended for man's freedom of choice, and would rather see the universe shattered than any exterior force exerted over the will. "The color of our future existence," he said, "will be wholly determined by the habits and principles which we carry into it." Yet although this, he said, was "according to the Scriptures," he was unable to decide whether the reformation of the sufferer, or the extinction of his conscious being, would be the result of the pains and penalties of wrong-doing, in the world to come. On this question the Scripture threw no clear light, to him; but why not, if the habits and principles we carry into the future world are to color the whole existence there, and man is to be immortal? Neither reformation nor extinction of being can be deduced from such premises; and no change in the color of existence is to be expected by changing worlds, either for the good or the evil! But how is moral agency or freedom consulted in fixing the end of a few years as the time when a coloring is to be given to eternity, and no longer can the invitation be heard to change the crimson sin to snowy holiness?

The "supposition," on which the view of death, now under consideration, is built, is set forth by Dr. Barnes, in his Essay on Butler's Analogy. This is the passage: "Results *in eternity*, we suppose, are but *the transfer to another state* of results, which would take place here, if the guilty were not removed. We ask the infidel, — we ask the Univeralist, — why this state of things should be arrested at death? It belongs to the infidel and the Universalist to prove that the affairs of the universe come to a solemn pause at death; that we are ushered into a world of different laws, and different principles of government,— that we pass under a new sceptre, a sceptre, too, not of *justice*, but of disorder, misrule, and the arrest of all that God has begun in his administration; that the *results* of conduct manifestly just commencing here, are finally arrested by some strange and unknown principle at our death; and that we are to pass to a world of which we know nothing, and in which we have no means of conjecturing what will be the treatment which crime and virtue will receive. We ask them, can they *demonstrate* this strange theory?" *Whose* theory is it that a solemn

Digitized by Google

pause comes to the affairs of the universe at death, and that then we pass under a new government and sceptre? Surely it is not the theory of any Universalist, but of those who hold up this world as the scene of probation, the next as the scene of retribution, — who extend to the sinner the hope of escaping the "results" of his sinful conduct, even by a death-bed repentance, or a scaffold-confessed penitence, — who cause the flow of existence to pause at death's doors, till it can pass through a process that fixes its color once for all. But why assert so boldly and without qualification, that the "results," to which the Essayist's creed directs his attention in eternity, are but the results which would take place here, if the guilty were not removed? Is there no such thing as reformation, as Providence changing the tendencies of things, making the wrath of man to praise God, and restraining the remainder? Why, then, assert that eternal wo *must* meet the sinner in eternity, while it is maintained that the principles of the divine government are *not* changed at death? The real difficulty in the case lies in a misconception of what *are* the principles of the divine government. They are not regarded as the principles of parental love. The Essayist does not regard the principles of that government as consulting the universal good, and, reasoning from analogy, — from what he deems is *now* the course of the divine administration to what it probably *will be*, — he comes to the conclusion that eternity will manifest the same disregard of universal good! The grand error of all such reasoning lies in taking for granted, that criminal desire and purpose and activity will be perpetuated in eternity, and form a murky atmosphere, in which thunder will continually roll and lightnings flash. It is not for *us* to prove that "the affairs of the universe come to a solemn pause at death;" it is enough for us to take the revelations of Christ, pertaining to God's minute and universal providence, and look forward with hope for our race, and consequently for ourselves. We see every day "results of conduct" arrested. The physician and the reformer are exhibiting skill and wisdom in that way continually. We do not need to dwell on some "strange and unknown principle at death," but we do need to remember the effective grace of God, how he taketh the

Digitized by Google

wise in their own craftiness, and leadeth the blind in a way they know not of. Here is the inebriate; reckless folly for years has marked his course, and he is awfully debased; the tenderest sympathies seem all dead, and he appears, to use a theologian's figure, "half brute and half devil." But now,—suddenly as the flash of a gun or the wink of an eye,—a tone, a look, arrests his whole being,—he is held as by an irresistible power, and he is changed,—contrary to all expectancy, and even against the prophecies of the most hopeful. A glorious fabric rises from the human ruins, and the light of a noble intellect beams upon it. Audubon, in speaking of the Zenaida dove, mentions a pirate, who assured him that it was the soft and melancholy voice of the doves that awoke long slumbering feelings in his breast, and brought him to virtue's path away from deeds of violence and blood. Men have been lifted to godlike heights of virtue, and been pulled down by deceit practised upon a mere appetite; but do we not all look forward to a "solemn pause" which shall come, at death, to the strife of "fleshly lusts," that "war against the soul?" Marred and scarred humanity shall yet, in the free grace of our God, find a baptism in a Bethesda's pool, and walk forth "whole." "Whether is it easier," said the Master, "to say to the sick of the palsy, Thy sins be forgiven thee; or to say, Arise, and take up thy bed and walk?" Aye, there came to that palsied one "a solemn pause;" and who could wish it otherwise? The quickened blood, as it leaped through the veins and arteries, and reawakened the energies of nature, changing the whole man, may mean something even to us beyond the poetry of analogy.

We turn now to the last view concerning death and its agencies, which bids us anticipate a mighty change consequent on the separation from a weak, corruptible, and ignoble body, preparatory to the high worship of God by perpetual progress in the divine life.

Man is a body as well as a soul; and the great question is not how a man dies, but how is he raised up? There is no revelation of man's existence but in connection with a body, and the apostle's elaborate argument concerning the prerogatives of the immortal vehicle of mind, has too often been perverted and its sublime meaning disregarded. The

Digitized by Google

wise have owned that fearfully and wonderfully are we made, and they have lamented that still we are "spirits in prison." It is not irreverence thus to mourn. The Scriptures permit us to do so, while they present comforts flowing from the exchange that is to be made, as from the "tabernacle in the wilderness," to the "temple" in the Holy City. Here is exhibited a chief beauty in the Christian's hope of immortality. It recognizes not only a freedom from the perishable body in which the spirit now lives, but the clothing upon of another body, which, as John Wesley wrote, shall be "as active and nimble as our thoughts are." The body has much to do with the mind, and even an apostle tells us how he labored to keep his body under, in subjection to his spiritual aspirations. He meant much by his similitude of "flesh" and "spirit," and by his pathetic cry, "Who will deliver me from this body of death?" though he also spoke in his earnest manner of the "filthiness of the spirit," and the "renewing of the mind." The great victory, through redeeming grace, to which he looked forward, was the triumph of the soul in a state where the sting of death would be destroyed, a comparative spiritual body inhabited, and where genius and expression would correspond and harmonize. His great labor, in his grand exposition of the doctrine of the resurrection, was to prove the ability of God to raise the soul and give a body adapted to the state he anticipated. He first cites the seed of the grain; then he refers to animals, and then rises to the heavenly *bodies*, proceeding to specify, as in other instances, the *variety* exhibited, the *glory* of which, or the manifestation of the divine power and wisdom in which, forms another illustration of the unlimited energy of the Creator in forming organizations according to any exigence in the universe. All through this there is an unbroken chain of *illustration*. All along the chain runs the light of one idea—the creation and adaptation of bodies to every relation instituted by the Almighty in his universe. "So also," *i. e.* this illustration of God's wisdom and power holds good; "So also [is] the resurrection of the dead. It," *i. e.*, something comparable to the seed, having a body as God is pleased to give, and retaining its identity through its change,—"It is sown in corruption, it is raised in incorruption. It is sown

Digitized by Google

in dishonor, it is raised in glory; it is sown in weakness, it is raised in power; it is sown a natural body, it is raised a spiritual body. There is a natural body," *that* we know; "there is a spiritual body," *that* we must have faith in. Dr. Whitby, in his comments on this passage, remarks, "The word *sown* does not relate to the body's being laid in the earth, but rather to its production in the world." Corruption, dishonor, weakness, are the characteristics of the body in which the germ of life here manifests itself, but the opposite excellences will be the prerogative of the immortal vehicle of mind. The spirit shall not be at fault with the instrument of its action; every chord shall respond to the touch of the invisible potency, and the war of "the spirit" and "the members" shall be heard of no more forever. Glorious are the agencies of death that break the bands that bind the soul to its cage of clay. A spiritual body implies a spiritual world; and when this change shall be enjoyed, then shall the attributes of mind be made known. No longer burdened by diseases, weakened by shame, and crippled in its energies, it shall put itself forth in fruitfulness that shall please the eyes of angels and glorify God indeed. Who can tell what mental and moral changes will be wrought by this transformation? None; yet the earnest language of Scripture forbids us to doubt the entire happiness of our race. The mind never could dream that in the crawling worm was enfolded such beauty as glitters in the sunshine, when the butterfly floats on the balmy air, like winged poetry; but yet

> "—— such is man, soon from his cell of clay,
> To burst a seraph in the blaze of day."

Our disquisition thus far will avail but little with a large class of Christians, who regard it as the best philosophy and religion "not to speculate, but to fear," notwithstanding "perfect love casteth out fear, and fear hath torment;" and in neglect also of the great fact that Jesus took part of flesh and blood, that through death, he might deliver them who through fear of death were all their lifetime subject to bondage. The argument is, that the vicious need a fearful dread of death to keep them from further advances in guilt; and we are seriously asked, "What forbids our applying to a punishment that is to terminate with the pre-

Digitized by Google

sent life, the same reflections which we employ for our consolation under the afflictions of the world? Poignant as they are, they cannot be of great importance in themselves, for they cannot continue long." Such exceptions are easily answered, for the nature or the subject is such, that the persuasives of truth are not to be appreciated by the vicious; for guilt hath its own superstitions; and to "walk in the fear of the Lord" is essential to the enjoyment of "the comfort of the Holy Spirit." As we use an awful fear and a terrific dread to overawe and restrain, we modify the apprehension of that love which is mightiest to reform. "He that *winneth* souls is wise," for he that is won, is bound by a spiritual and eternal bond. Such a reformer will never employ the truth to make free, and then turn with threatenings and declare that after "a *day* of grace,"

"The keen vibration of bright truth is hell."

A Christian reduced to the low condition of finding comfort in affliction from the single thought that it will soon be over, might well imagine a guilty soul seeking the same relief in his misery, for God's peculiar relations to the human soul are overlooked in such an estimate of things. The Divine purpose cannot be evaded by any thoughts of duration, and the true sources of comfort to piety, in affliction, are utterly unlike any relief which unrepentant guilt can find under the retributions of Heaven. "The exclusion of the idea of retribution from our views of the future life must deprive us of some of the grounds on which men may be most effectually urged to the practice of virtue." Such is the idea of a writer who evidently had the Universalist in mind when he wrote his essay; but which is the best motive to incite a mind to the pursuit of the highest order of virtue, to the doing of God's will on the earth as it is done in heaven,—the hideous dread of death and its agencies, or that love of God which springs to his service as the lark to the skies? Said the good Fenelon, "God desires to have children that should love him for his goodness, and not slaves who only serve him through dread of his power to curse." Such children as can say with Sir Thomas Browne, "I was never afraid of hell, nor never grew pale at the description of that place. That terrible term hath never detained me from sin, nor do I owe

Digitized by Google

any good action to the name thereof. I can hardly think there was ever any scared into heaven; they go the fairest way to heaven that would serve God without a hell." Death is surrounded with fearfulness and terror, with no higher motive than to make mere *legal* Christians; for the assertion is, that fear and dread of future punishment is the most effectual enforcement of the practice of virtue; and the admission is made in so many words, that if a young man says he is willing to risk the chances of this life and resolves on wrong doing, nothing can be replied to him unless the terrors of eternity are brought to view! A reply might be made that would sweep away the idea of chance, and that would make the chances of virtue appear otherwise than "dim, cold, and undesirable." And this we think could easily be done by a writer who admits that "unquestionably it is true, in general," (and *why* the exception?) "that the religious man, the pure, benevolent, and devout man, enjoys this life more highly than the man of an opposite character." Cannot this "unquestionable" truth be made evident? Has not its manifestation been so commended to the consciences of men, as to produce the happiest results — results as much superior to the character moulded by fear, as the motives are more excellent; permanent, because connected with immortal progress, influencing the highest seraph and the archangel.

Death and its agencies are controlled by sovereign and efficacious love. Before the glory of our idea of immortality, the splendor of the heavens and the richness of the earth are as nothing, — royalty and state are a mimic pageant of an hour. Man shall be immortal. Memory shall link him to the past. His identity shall be unharmed, unmarred. The circumstances of that new life shall manifest the grace of God in all their relations, and memory shall keep the soul humble and grateful, in union with the beloved who were here given to our affections. "He that is dead is freed from sin," for God will "swallow up death in victory;" the "last enemy, death, shall be destroyed;" and on the ear of the universe the last sigh of humanity shall fade away, and evil be no more. H. B—N.

Digitized by Google

Art. XXIX.

Lessons of Theology taught in the Works of Creation.

The lessons which nature teaches are never dull, never tiresome. The more hours we spend in her study, the more attached do we become to the instructions which she affords us. Unlike the dry rudiments of human learning, we can go over and over again the same routine, and there is no weariness, no insipidity. Dull, uninteresting, and laborious, both to the teacher and the learner, are those elementary principles, without the knowledge of which the doors of the temple of science are forever closed. But when nature takes her children by the hand, that she may introduce them into her mysteries, every step is fraught with delight. In the unfolding of the flower, the music of the stream, and the balminess of the air, the eye never tires, the ear is never dull, the taste is never satiated. We are as familiar with these things as with our household gods; and like the sweets of home, they bear about them a perennial freshness, an unfading bloom.

The reader is invited to range with me over the works of creation. The course we shall pursue is beautifully expressed by the poet :

> "The turf shall be my fragrant shrine;
> My temple's dome, that arch of thine;
> My censer's breath, the mountain air;
> And silent thoughts, my only prayer."

It will at once be perceived that the feast which is offered to the reader is no new one. It promises us no rare delicacies; but though he has continually partaken from the same board, yet if the mind be in a healthy state, he will return to it with a fresh appetite.

"O Lord, how manifold are thy works." Earth is the scene of *multitudinous* existence. When you ramble abroad on one of the bright days in early spring, or the riper summer months, what a prospect strikes the eye! all is full of life, active, diverse, changing, buoyant, joyous animation. It seems as if every speck, however minute, was a theatre on which some being was destined to act a joyful

Digitized by Google

part in the great drama of existence. There is no spot unoccupied by sentient being. Those situations which would induce death, by famine, to some classes of being, are the most favorable to the support and comfort of others. Every inch is eagerly claimed by its appropriate tenant. If you leave the fertile fields teeming with life, and penetrate into the dry and sandy desert, you will not be alone. Your pathway will be crossed by the painted lizard, arrayed in a dress of green and yellow, whose brilliant colors defy imitation; his rapid and sparkling course over the white sand will be like the falling of a star through the milky-way. He does not, however, like the fabled chameleon, feed on air, but an unseen hand is giving him his portion in due season. Would you ascend the steep and rocky precipice? you will find it tenanted by the wild goat. Its scanty herbage and stinted bushes furnish out a feast for its frugal and hardy inhabitant. Climb to the mountain-top, and, on its naked and barren breast, you will find numbers drawing a support. Descend into the dark caverns of the earth, and the echo of your footsteps shall startle the inmates of its gloomy prison-house. From the humble blade of grass to the towering monarch of the woods; on the hill and in the plain; plunged in the sparkling waters, or buoyant in the fields of ether, life in all its forms, varieties, shadows and colors, rejoices in its being, and dances in our sight.

If we descend to a far minuter survey, the same astonishing fact is presented to us with superadded force. Place the microscope, that revealer of the hidden things of nature, to the eye, and a new world of wonders at once opens before you. Every particle not only of earth, but bud, blossom, and fruit, are all alive with sentient being. Aided by this powerful instrument, the adamantine rock, the fire-giving flint, has been found to sustain its atomical tenant.

"The earth is full of thy riches." Creation is not only multitudinous in its productions, but it is bountiful in its supplies. It is rich, full and overflowing with the munificence of its Author. When the great Architect laid its deep foundations, and "curtained it with morning light," it was not enough grudgingly to portion out to its teeming multitudes a spare and insipid repast. This might have

Digitized by Google

served all the purposes of mere animal existence, but it did not come up to the design of the benevolent Creator. God did not, in the creation of man, intend for him a merely vegetative being, but one of enjoyment and bliss. The flower might have supported its insect, without delighting our eye with its robe of glory, or regaling our sense with its fragrance. The juicy fruit might have satisfied the craving appetite, without administering gust and pleasure with its flavor and deliciousness. We might have inhabited a dull, formal, monotonous globe, and still have had life and being. But divine goodness prepared something better for us, and when we see such exhibitions of loveliness around us, we are compelled to exclaim, "How great is his goodness and how great is his beauty!" What a glorious palace do we inhabit! what a carpet has nature spread for us in her verdant lawns, inwoven with the hues of ten thousand flowers! what drapery does she hang out in the gold-fringed clouds of her rising and setting suns? what a more than regal dome of azure, with glittering lamps, do we behold in the clear blue concave lighted with the stars of heaven! Why, all that man has attained to, in his proudest efforts and happiest results, has been a feeble and humble imitation of his great Master's work.

Then look at man, mysterious, wonderful, fearfully made man, the acknowledged and delegated lord of these lower works! What avenues of enjoyment have been opened up to him! what sensibilities! what affections! what sympathies! Silken cords bind him to life with magic ties; and when these ties, one by one, are loosened (and loosened they must be,) then glorious hopes, and blissful anticipations, and irrepressible aspirations, happily steal in to supply their place, and point the soul to a higher and more enduring state of being.

Bounties conferred call for gratitude on the part of the receiver. That gratitude seems much enhanced from considering the manner in which the favor has been granted. There is something very touching, to a feeling and delicate mind, in the silent and unostentatious offerings which nature lays before us. It seems an exemplification of that maxim of the great Teacher, "let not thy left hand know what thy right hand doeth." The table is spread, but no blast of the trumpet invites to the feast. Like the manna

Digitized by Google

which fed the Israelites in the wilderness, it falls stilly and noiselessly around our habitations. "The circling seasons in their orbits run;" the day and night alternately rule, but all is order, harmony and silence. The earth from her fertile bosom pours forth her riches into the lap of abundance, and then modestly retires, but only to return for a fresh supply. When her maiden shroud of pure whiteness is cast upon her bosom, it may be said of her, as Jesus said of the damsel on whom he was about to exercise his life-giving power, "She is not dead, but sleepeth." In these long nights of silence and repose, the earth is only recruiting her energies, gathering up her exhausted forces, and preparing for a fresh exhibition of her productive powers. And those unknown and untried worlds, which in "mystic dance" surround us, whose fleet course through space is only equalled in speed by the swift-winged arrows of light — what histories could they narrate of infinite beneficence, if their voices were as loud as their light is brilliant! But though there is neither voice nor sound, they have a language which speaks to the heart. Silently but surely, affectingly do they proclaim divine power and wisdom — power and wisdom unspeakably great; so that we are unconsciously led to feel and adopt that exquisitely beautiful sentiment of the poet,

> "Come, then, expressive silence, muse his praise!"

It is perhaps owing to this quiet progress of nature around us, that so many of the blessings of heaven pass unnoticed. The mere sensualist sees and appreciates nothing but what is palpable and tangible. And perhaps there are few of us who can bring ourselves, as often as we ought, to a profitable contemplation of the subject. We are too much engrossed with the possession, to trace the blessing to its source. In what a variety of ways, — often unseen and unknown, — does Providence deposit his benefactions! As the tender and careful mother watches all the wants of her unconscious babe, and silently performs every office of love, so the great Parent of the human family watches over us, brings forth the necessary supplies, and gives no louder call for our gratitude than what a sense of the benefit received may supply. While ministering angels guard our pillows, during nearly one half our being,

Digitized by Google

and vanish with the shades of night, there is no alarum bell rung in our ears, to call us to our morning orisons. Though in the darkness of the night, and during the deep stillness of its unbroken solitudes, the arms of mercy encircle us, there comes no voice of authority demanding the utterance of our praise. And it is well there is not. Did nature cry aloud and enforce obedience, devotion in this respect would, I fear, become as formal as it is in most others. When its silent and unobtrusive appeals are listened to, we have good reason to believe "'tis the spirit stirs within us;" if those appeals were dictatorial, the lips might express what the heart but little felt, and then devotion would be but a vain and hollow oblation.

Bountiful and wise and rich as are the blessings of God; silent and touching as are their appeals to our gratitude, there is another feature in creation which endears it to us; it is a cheerful creation. Religion, I know not from what cause, has become too abstract, too morose, too gloomy. Where the error first began, I cannot tell; in what school it was learned, I know not; but I am sure it must have been a bad one, and it has made many melancholy and ascetic students. Perhaps it has originated from dwelling on the dark side of the picture, and the disposition to do so has been induced by retiring from the active scenes of nature to the severer studies of metaphysics. It has, however, never done any good, but an immensity of mischief. Religion, in all her holy and sanctifying influences, has been so disfigured with this sombre robe, that the young and timid have shunned her, and the sceptic and infidel have mocked her. And, then, when once this cold and abstracted appearance was identified with piety, a wide door was opened to hypocrisy, deceit and spiritual pride. Then the eremite dug his cell, and the Pharisee distorted his countenance, and the wily deceiver put on the convenient cloak to cover up his nefarious designs; then the offices of love were disregarded, or esteemed of small importance; the sympathies of nature were checked; the emotions of the heart were stifled, and sorrow and sighing, and mortification and penance were the tests of piety! And thus mankind have wept and groaned, from age to age; and that came to be considered the most devout epoch, in which the most sighs were registered, and most tears bot-

Digitized by Google

tled up. The spell is not entirely broken, for some mournful vestiges still remain. But how different a lesson from this, does nature teach her students! She speaks a language more consonant to reason, and, let it be added, to Scripture too. She tells us to serve the Lord with gladness, and to come into his presence with a song; to worship him with a happy and joyful spirit. And she is true to her own teaching. Mark her well, and you will see joy and hilarity pervade all her works. The wild winds, which no chains can bind; the ever fluctuating ocean, equally incontrollable; the babbling brook, and ten thousand tuneful but viewless strings which are struck around us, make the world a theatre of music and delight. Were we surrounded by an animate creation, dull, tame and formal, we might be possibly led to think such a disposition in ourselves consonant to the order of things. But how stands the case? The very reverse is true. Wherever a sentient creature is in the enjoyment of life and health, there you will discover symptoms of hilarity. This is not a melancholy and solemn, but a highly joyous world. It is vocal with joy. Look up to the hills, into the depths of the forests, on the plains, and the same truth appears. The songsters of the grove, the prancing steed, the sportive flocks, the bounding antelope, all that have life and activity, hurry along and testify to the buoyancy within. It is true that the ass walks forth with a slow and formal step — and he is a grave animal; and the owl, from the hollow tree or mouldering turret, moans forth her doleful ditty — and she is a solemn bird; but I envy not those students in the theology of nature, who pattern after these specimens, though they have in their deportment the gravity of the former, the solemnity of the latter, and are gifted with the united wisdom of both.

We have had occasion to speak of the ample provision which is made for all the varied tenants of the earth; and our admiration will be increased in examining the tender mercy and considerate care which is displayed in guiding them to their necessary supplies. From the eagle to the wren; from the gigantic elephant to the creeping insect indiscernible to the naked eye; in ocean, earth and sky, there is a pathway open, where each creature in the intermediate scale may obtain his supply. The prying eye of

Digitized by Google

human research has never discovered one in a thousand of these secret paths; and human ingenuity has never been able to account for that wonderful and unerring perceptive faculty that conducts the animal to its appropriate food. We call this instinct; we know it by that name; but it is only by a name that we know it. We have no just conception of that faculty, and perhaps we are as little acquainted with it as the brute creation is with our boasted reason. There is no passage so dark, so intricate, so apparently inacessible, but that some animal will find it a suitable pathway to his prey. He will travel it as quickly as if it were lighted with the mid-day sun; as direct as if it were a highway which could not be mistaken, and as securely as if no impediments or stumbling-blocks barred up his progress. Strange and wonderful is this mysterious light, which thus directs all creatures in their course! Though we cannot analyze its nature, let us not mistake the source from which it is derived. From whence can it come, if not from that mighty intellectual Fountain, which is continually sending forth streams of light and knowledge, portions of which, according as they can bear it, are distributed to all creatures, leading them through labyrinths, guiding them in heights, revealing hidden things in depths, supporting the weak, restraining the strong, opening the treasure-house of nature, and pointing out to each his supply, his abode, his asylum.

We should do but very imperfect justice to our subject, if, in dwelling on the provisions made for the appetites of animals, we should omit to notice the vesture with which their bodies are clothed. What a subject for admiration is here opened to us! Man first taxed his ingenuity to provide himself with a rude covering, to shield him from the vicissitudes of clime and the inclemency of the weather. Having attained this object, fancy, and perhaps vanity, led him to adorn as well as to clothe himself. But he had to go to the fields and the forests, the regions of air and the deeps of the sea, and levy contributions on their inhabitants for materials for his handiwork. And his research has only been equalled by the ingenuity displayed in making the various tribes of animals and plants subservient to his purpose. A votary of fashion is debtor to every clime, yea, to the "uttermost ends of the earth." The ostrich,

Digitized by Google

from the burning deserts of the torrid zone, furnishes the waving plume. The fur-clad tenant of the eternal snows of the ice-bound pole supplies its soft covering. There is scarcely an animal that ranges the forest, or stealthily and noiselessly wends his way through the bowing bulrushes, or by the still water-courses; there is no bird of golden and proud plumage, which has not been tributary to this service. The whale himself, the mammoth of the deep, has laid his long elastic bones on the altar of fashion.

While we admire the cunning devices of human art, in thus manufacturing the materials, let us not lose sight of the infinitely more wonderful power which has furnished the original dress to the animals themselves. "They toil not, neither do they spin," and yet they are arrayed with more than regal splendor. Where is the monarch's robe that can vie with the plumage of the pheasant, or the bird of paradise? Where is the loom, with all its boasted delicacy, that can rival the aerial fabric of the butterfly's wing, or the thistle's down? What art could fabricate the feather? or where could human contrivance supply the fur that mantles round the hardy tenant of the north? How admirable is that beneficent care which has adapted an appropriate dress to the wants of every creature! The fur, the feather and the scale, as they respectively clothe the beast of the forest, the fowl of the air, and the fish of the sea, bear about them such indisputable evidences of infinite Intelligence, that Atheism itself quails beneath their silent testimony.

And what, we may now very properly inquire, is the great lesson taught us in these every-day miracles? It is surely that which the good Master inculcated in the early age of his kingdom on earth. It is a confiding reliance on the power, the wisdom, and the goodness of the Creator, that trinity of attributes, whose glorious union constitutes the perfection of the Deity, and the consolation of humanity. Happy are those quiet students of nature, who, having escaped the jargon of the schools and the unmeaning subtleties of metaphysics, have laid the illuminated page of inspiration on the altar of nature, and called on reason to be its interpreter! To them there are no frightful phantoms, the offspring of a sickly and puny imagination, to terrify with unreal alarms; no heated en-

Digitized by Google

thusiasm, no blind or furious fanaticism to scorch with its wild fires, or to chill with its icy and unfeeling doctrines; but all is calm, dignified, and orderly.

"Confide in God"—that is the great lesson. You may read it in all you see around you; at every step you take abroad in nature's domains, you may read the blissful sentiment traced in rainbow hues on the lily of the valley. You may hear it warbled in the vesper hymn of the songster on the flowery spray. It is blazoned forth in the eaglet's eye that steadily gazes on the noonday sun. It twinkles in the sparkling wing of the firefly, or mildly shines in the softer light of the glow-worm. Let not an evil heart of unbelief rob us of the consolation, that he who has given instinctive knowledge to the minutest of his sentient creatures, to guide it safely to a happy consummation, will ever watch over human interests; and never, as some blindly imagine, leave men to wander in inextricable labyrinths, or to plunge into a gulf beyond the reach of his arm of mercy. C. F. L. F.

Art. XXX.

The Sources of National Prosperity and Ruin.

It has been usual, with us, to insist on the great moral and religious doctrine, that God judges and rewards every man according to his works. Perhaps there is no truth of more importance to us, in the conduct of life; perhaps, too, there is scarcely any which it has been found more difficult to make people really believe and feel. There had been so general an impression that this world is not a state of retribution, people had so long been accustomed to suppose that God does not here call us to an account for our conduct, but that he lets us go on without reward or punishment for the present, reserving the recompense altogether for the future state of being,—this idea had so universally prevailed, that people were wholly at a loss to understand how it could be that God does actually reward every indi-

Digitized by Google

vidual, in this life, according to his deserts. They knew not what to make of the doctrine, when it was first taught among us. They looked only to outward circumstances and appearances; they did not see God's hand coming out into open view in judgment, and they therefore concluded that there was no judgment executed here, but that it was all put off to the future. They thought not to seek for God's righteous administration, in the inevitable consequences, internal as well as external, which flow from obedience on the one hand, and from disobedience on the other. Had they but looked there, they would have seen this everlasting truth written all over the face of divine providence, as plainly as on the page of divine inspiration, that "there is a God that judgeth in the earth." How much Scripture was it necessary to quote, and to repeat, and to reiterate; how much theological argument and illustration and controversy were expended, over and over again, before people could be generally brought to understand that God is the same just Governor, here as hereafter, and that he executes his justice in this world as well as in the next! He seemed to them afar off, seated in some inconceivably high region of the universe, looking down upon us, at an immense distance, and merely taking note of our actions, in order to bring us to a reckoning when we should pass from this world into his presence. A present God, in whom we now live, move and have our being, was not in all their thoughts. They little considered that he is always with us, even here, and that his justice, as well as all his other perfections, is around us, on every hand, and within us, pervading our souls and the whole course of our affairs, and that we perpetually stand before that tribunal where every man is dealt with according to his doings.

This truth is, indeed, a mystery with many, even to this day; a stumbling-block to multitudes, who continue to retain the old traditionary views of the subject. But still, it so manifestly appears a matter of fact, when we look abroad on what is going on in the community; we feel it to be so true in our own consciences, when we consider our past experience; and then, again, it is so plainly and so frequently asserted in the Scriptures, that it has at last overcome the prejudices of the more reflecting thinkers in all

Digitized by Google

denominations; and it is now acknowledged, to a considerable extent, that "the righteous are recompensed in the earth, much more the wicked and the sinner." There has been a great change of the public sentiment, in this respect, within the last thirty years. We now find many, even in "the straightest sects," who maintain that God does indeed recompense men here, for what they do here; though they still think that the same diversity of character will remain hereafter, and that the same course of retribution will be there continued.

But there is one bearing of this great truth, which has never been so much attended to; we mean, its bearing on national and political concerns. God judges among the nations of the earth, as among individuals, and recompenses, into their own bosoms respectively, all their measures and practices, whether for good, or for evil. He marks their characters, detects their moral tendencies; sees all the motives from which they act, and the principles on which they frame their policy; and brings on them the natural result, in spite of all their efforts to turn it aside. Universalists have long contended for the doctrine that God judges individuals in righteousness, and that he blesses or chastises them exactly according to their moral deserts; that no one escapes, nor can escape; that if the retribution does not come upon them in one way, it will overtake them in some other way,—inevitable, sure as fate. Have we ever considered that the same inexorable law is true, with respect to communities, states, and nations? and that God holds these to as strict an account, for all their privileges, conduct and motives, as he does individuals? Nothing can be plainer, than that if the doctrine be true, in one respect, it must likewise be so, in the other; for it is individuals that make up nations. There can be no more escape from God's evenhanded justice, in the latter case, than in the former, manage howsoever the parties may; no more escape for a state, a government, or a faction, than for an individual. Howsoever confident either of them may be, in their own strength, or resources, or skill, or foresight, they cannot elude the reckoning to which God holds them. Human strength, and dexterity, and far-reaching calculation, are never the ultimate sources of prosperity, nor the want of these the causes of decay. Back behind all these,

Digitized by Google

is the eternal law of justice, forever in operation, trying every thing by the inflexible standard of Right, and confounding every thing that does not agree with this. Righteousness or corruption — these are the permanent issues of life or death to a nation.

This is a consideration which we have not been accustomed to keep before us. Our attention, in times past, has been engrossed chiefly with the bearings of the general principle on individuals only. In this respect, we have indeed labored well to illustrate and enforce it, until at length it has been carried home to people's conviction, with a considerable degree of success. But we ourselves have not traced it out in relation to the same individuals, when collected together in great bodies, such as states and empires, nor observed how it operates on their civil and political destiny. On this point, perhaps, we are, as a denomination, no farther advanced, as yet, than other sects around us; and, here, we need to be taught, as much as they, what are the first principles of the very doctrine we profess. We must habituate ourselves to recognize the divine justice, displayed as clearly on the broad theatre of national existence, as in the narrower circle of private life.

There is, indeed, one material difference which we cannot but expect to find in the two cases; one that rises out of the difference between the natural age of an empire, and that of man. The active life of an individual, here on earth, is very brief, — only about forty years, or at most but sixty; while nations sometimes survive for nearly as many ages. We must, therefore, make a corresponding allowance, as to time, in the two cases. The events, that mark the short space of a man's life, are thickly crowded; in a nation's history, they stand proportionately farther apart. If an individual goes astray, we commonly see the punishment following very speedily; and, on the other hand, if he does well, the reward is not long delayed. Two or three years generally serve to raise him to prosperity, or sink him to ruin; so that we have to wait but a little while, in order to see the justice of God's providence overtake him in his career, for good or for evil. But in order to trace the divine retributions, in the history of a state, we must substitute ages for years, in our scale of observation. It takes much longer to corrupt the general mass of a

Digitized by Google

people, than to corrupt an individual; and, then, the consequences of depravity, on so vast and complicate a scene, are much slower in coming on, and gathering to a head. Who does not see that the same remark holds true, also, with respect to the reformation of public morals? for the character of fifteen or twenty millions cannot be changed in a month, as that of a man may be. It is the work of many years, — of one or two generations, at the shortest. And even when, at last, the reformation is accomplished, a considerable period must elapse, before its beneficial influence can be very manifest in the improvement of public affairs. These are the chief reasons why the judgment of God is slower to take effect on the fortune of nations, than in the case of individuals, though it is equally sure. And if we would study its operations there, we must take in a space of time that is proportionately larger. Survey the past history of empires, from generation to generation; follow them down the course of ages; take any people we please, of whom we have accounts sufficiently particular; and it is surprising how faithfully their fate has followed their conduct, and how exactly it has answered, sooner or later, to their moral character.

If we look back into the Old Testament, we shall find, there, a strong confirmation of the doctrine we have proposed. We mention the Old Testament, because that is devoted, in a considerable degree, to national affairs, while the New seldom takes any direct notice of them, but is confined almost exclusively to man as an individual. During the former dispensation, however, the Jewish people were perpetually admonished, in the most solemn manner, that their nation would fare just as they themselves conducted; that their public and national prosperity depended on their obedience to God's laws, rather than on any worldly wisdom by which they might manage their concerns. We do not mean that human prudence and foresight were of no avail in their public counsels, nor that these means were to be neglected. It was, of course, important for them, as for all other bodies politic, that their rulers and statesmen should have correct views in what is called political science, in order to devise such particular measures as were best adapted to national welfare, in the several crises through which they passed. But let it be

Digitized by Google

observed that these, though important, are everywhere treated as but secondary matters. Over and above all these, there is always held up the fact that God would advance them to prosperity, or confound them and all their wisdom, accordingly as they walked in his fear, or trampled on the everlasting laws of righteousness. From the day that Moses led them out of the bondage of Egypt, till more than a thousand years afterwards, when Malachi closed the long succession of their prophets, the voice of Heaven was continually announcing to them, in one form or another, this fearful warning, "I have set before you the way of life, and the way of death. If ye obey me, ye shall eat the good of the land; if ye transgress, ye shall surely be destroyed?" Here was the point on which every thing ultimately turned, with them. In the law given to them from Mount Sinai, they were assured that, so long as they hearkened diligently unto the Lord, they should be blessed in their fields and in all their coasts, their enemies should be put to flight before them, and no weapon formed against them should prosper; but that, if they refused to keep his commands, and turned away from their allegiance, they should be cursed, as a people, in all their possessions, filled with confusion and violence throughout their borders, overthrown in war, scattered abroad, and made a hissing on all the face the earth. How often do we find the prophets, in succeeding ages, repeating to them these terrible declarations! And we know, from their history, that these warnings (seldom believed, alas! till too late,) were literally fulfilled, in their case at least; and this, too, not only in the dreadful scene of their final destruction, but in every stage of their career. Their national fortune always rose or fell, with the improvement or degeneracy of their moral condition. May we not take this as a warning to ourselves, and to our own nation?

At times, they used every resource of political cunning, craft, and ambition, to maintain their standing, and to further their interests. They extended their dominion, with all the temporary exultation of conquerors; but it was only to dissipate their strength, and to provoke civil dissensions, and finally separation. They entered into alliances with other powers to hold themselves up; they leaned, now, on the strong arm of Egypt, now on Assyria, now on mighty

Digitized by Google

Babylon; but it was all in vain, when corruption prevailed among themselves. In the vehement language of the prophet, they made a covenant with death, and an agreement with hell, to strengthen themselves; but they had the Almighty God against them. Their refuge of lies was swept away, and they went down beneath his repeated judgments, like the strong oak of the forest under the shivering thunder-bolt. It was for their corruption, they were destroyed, and not for want of worldly skill and policy. Their iniquities, public and private, were the burden that weighed them down: So declared the prophets with unanimous voice; so declared Jesus Christ, with reference to their last and complete destruction.

When we think of these things, we confess we cannot but turn an anxious eye to the prospects of our own beloved country; especially, when we see so few of our fellow-citizens apparently aware of what it is on which our fate is suspended, — when we see them so generally relying, for national salvation, on mere political manœuverings, without looking to any thing deeper. If there is any truth in the Old Testament, let the example of ancient Israel awaken us in season, and remind us where our real danger, as well as our safety, lies, — in those moral principles that underlie all government, and all political measures. Let it not be supposed that the case of the Jews was an exception to the general rule of God's government, nor that he interfered, in some peculiar way, to regulate their fortunes by their moral deserts, as he does not with other nations. We may see the same principle exemplified, with equal regularity, in the history of every other people with which we are equally acquainted. Look back to ancient Greece, through her annals that have come down to us. As long as her states preserved their hardy, frugal, and uncorrupted manners, in public and in private life, they stood uncrushed, a little band of indomitable spirits, against the world in arms. Even party-spirit, that necessary evil in free governments, was sanctified by a sound principle that lay beneath. What was it that overthrew Greece, at last? The same that has undermined all other extinct Republics. Luxury came in; the manners of the people grew extravagant; their moral integrity gave way; their politics became mere chicanery, trickishness and fac-

Digitized by Google

tion; and that was the end of their freedom, as it must be with every people among whom these evils get the ascendency. Such, too, in brief, is the history of that most gigantic power which ever overshadowed the earth — old Rome. After five centuries of iron rule, and of unobstructed prosperity, corruption entered and spread through that huge Republic, changed her government to a despotism, and steadily wrought out the ruin of the empire, slowly, but surely. Rome, with her colossal frame of iron, was hard to die. She lay in the mortal agony, four hundred years; but her death was as certain as fate, from the hour that moral rottenness had infected all the bones and sinews of the body politic. Look at the mediæval Republics of Italy, of Switzerland, and the more recent ones of South America, in which the same eternal law of the moral world determined the issues. And those who come after us, will certainly find the same all-controlling principles illustrated in the history of our own country, whether we are wise enough to foresee their operation here, or not. They will operate here, as they have done everywhere else, and determine our civil fate, accordingly as our people adhere to the straight and narrow way that leadeth to life, or run loose into the broad road of destruction.

We suppose the common, vague impression, with those who have never thought closely on this matter, is, that what is called the love of liberty, (that is, the love of our own liberty, without regard to that of others,) joined to a good degree of political information, with sharp Yankee insight, and ready tact in managing public affairs, is enough to insure success, without much respect to the laws of Heaven. We say to ourselves, with our world-renowned self-complacency and self-sufficiency, We have an excellent form of government, the best on the face of the earth. The spirit of freedom beats strong in the thousand-fold pulse of our entire community; and that will be a sufficient safeguard to us. Our people are distinguished, above all others, for their enterprise and shrewdness; and they will therefore take good care of themselves, for their own interests will lead them to see to this. And what is more than all, we have privileges, social, civil and religious, above those which any other nation enjoys, — more light, more freedom, more advantages of every kind; and, with

Digitized by Google

our keen jealousy of our rights, there is no danger of our throwing them away. But, then, has it ever come into our thoughts, that just in proportion to the greatness of these privileges, is the magnitude of the account that we, as a nation, shall have to render for them, before the world, if there is a God above and around us, to bring us to a reckoning for our use or abuse of them! Yes, we know that our privileges are great, indeed,—thank God for them; but this very fact will fill us with the more anxiety, if we regard the matter in its true light. "For unto whomsoever much is given, of them shall be much required," and if they do not according to their means, they shall be beaten with the more stripes. This is God's inexorable law, which our country can neither evade, nor put off. And now, is there any body who thinks that the improvement of our community at large, in virtue, in honesty or justice in dealing between man and man, in sobriety of manners, in frugality, in political integrity and public principle, in redressing instead of extending old wrongs under which a whole race groans and cries against us to Heaven,—is our improvement, in these respects, at all commensurate with the blessings God has intrusted us with? We do not like to speak in the tone of alarmists; but we declare that this is a most fearful question. It touches the very vitals of our national well-being. We confess, we dare not look it straight in the face. Unless our doctrine, that God judges in the earth, is false; unless it be false that he judges nations as well as individuals, we shall be called to a strict account for the talents he has placed in our hands; and when that day of reckoning comes, the Judge of all the earth will do right. If we, as a people, shall have learned to do unto others, as we would they should do unto us; if we shall have grown better under our privileges, more upright, more devoted to principle in all our transactions public and private, if we shall have shown mercy according to our power; then we may hope for his forbearance with such imperfections as shall still remain among us. But if, on the other hand, we shall have grown worse, in spite of our blessings, more ambitious, more grasping, more determined on perpetuating old wrongs, more unprincipled and corrupt, factious, heedless of what is right in itself, and regardful only of temporary expediency, or of a narrow

Digitized by Google

self-interest, our fate will be sealed. Our bond of national union will prove to be but a mass of smoking flax, setting us all in a flame. We shall break up in confusion, as others have done before us, from similar causes, and this last experiment of a free government will go out in shame. No policy under heaven can save us.

Are not these conclusions themselves, self-evident? that is, on the supposition that there is a just God in *this* world, and that he holds nations accountable to his law. Nations, as well as individuals, "live, move, and have their being in him." He is around them on every hand, interpenetrates, pervades them, with his all-searching justice, like "a consuming fire;" marks their character, their doings, the secret motives from which they act; and judges them accordingly. Men do not, indeed, see him at work in palpable form; and therefore, perhaps, they never think of these considerations. But every measure, every course of policy, is arraigned before another tribunal than that of public opinion; at a tribunal where justice is sure to be done, whether men do it or not. There are, in every nation, counsels deeper than those we see playing on the surface. God is behind the scene; and just as our purposes comport with his eternal law, will they prove ultimately salutary or blighting.

We may illustrate the subject in a clearer manner, perhaps, by suggesting a more analytical treatment of it. So far as our own country is concerned, the way in which the case naturally operates, is this: In Republics, it is the people themselves who are the nation. Of course, if they become corrupt, all is corrupt, "from the sole of the foot to the crown of the head;" but while they remain sound, all is sound. The administration may fall into errors or commit faults; but there is something back of it to retrieve these mistakes, by the regular working of the system; just as a wound in a healthy body is healed by the vital development from within, while a diseased constitution inflames and aggravates every sore. The government, on the whole, is what naturally grows out of the great mass of the people. We call its officers our *Representatives;* and truly; for they always exemplify the elements that predominate in the community by which they are selected. When the people at large lose the principle of strict moral integrity,

Digitized by Google

they will no longer regard it in others, nor require it in their legislators and rulers. If they become vain and extravagant, they will have no rulers but such as pamper all their appetites and humor all their caprices. The voice of sincerity and truth must be silent, and nothing but the treacherous words of flattery and adulation will be endured. When this is the case, all government grows into a mere scheme of management for selfish or party purposes, and becomes only a market for offices, and a counting-house of ambition. The question will no longer be, What is right? but, what will best gratify the popular passion, and at the same time most advance the private aims of unprincipled demagogues? The conduct of the state is wholly disconnected from the laws of Heaven, or rather, is set against them; and it requires but little philosophy or religion to foresee the result.

The practical lesson, which these considerations enforce upon us, as citizens, is obvious enough. Let every lover of his country, every friend to the permanence of our free government and institutions, take heed to mark where our real danger and our real safety lie. In every political action, let the eternal principles of justice and virtue be kept paramount. Sacrifice every measure, no matter how expedient it may seem, if it conflicts in the least with these principles. Sacrifice it, if necessary, even for party's sake; for the salvation of one's party depends on its being obliged to give up any course that is wrong, when once adopted. Strive, without ceasing, for the redress of old wrongs, and especially for the removal of the damning sin of bondage from our country. Do every thing in our power to reform the vices prevalent in the community, and to bring the public sentiment, and the public manners, to the standard of purity and righteousness. Whatsoever influence we have, let it be sacredly devoted to the promotion of sobriety, temperance, honesty, and firm integrity among our fellow-citizens. And, remember, that we are thus reaching the very springs of national prosperity, down far below all the measures in which the surface-politicians of the day are engaged.

H. B. 2d.

Digitized by Google

Art. XXXI.

Literary Notices.

1. The Rose of Sharon: A Religious Souvenir for 1847. Edited by Miss S. C. Edgarton. Boston: A. Tompkins & B. B. Mussey.

Another number of this popular Annual has appeared, equal, at least, in mechanical beauty, to its predecessors; superior to any of them, we think, in the varied excellence and ability of its contents. We have room only for a very slight and hasty notice. Several familiar names we miss from the list of contributors. Their places are filled by some new comers — P. H. Sears, J. M. Edgarton, D. H. Barlow, T. S. King, Mrs. F. M. Chesebro'. Among many prose articles of more than ordinary merit, it is hardly just to particularize. We have been exceedingly pleased, however, with the criticism of Wordsworth, by A. D. Mayo. It is written in pure and easy style, displays an accurate acquaintance with the spirit and writings of the great bard, and evinces a purity of taste and critical ability of no common order. The poem "Aurora Borealis," by Thomas B. Thayer, though suggesting, perhaps, too much the mannerism of Longfellow's verse, has great poetic merit, and some lines and images of exceeding beauty. We would call attention, also, to the poems "Udollo," and "The Lord de Beaumonaire," by Miss S. C. Edgarton, (now Mrs. Mayo.) They are, unquestionably, the finest productions of her ready pen. The article, "Regeneration and Faith," by John M. Edgarton, is a piece of extraordinary merit. The ideas are fresh, original, and profound; the style sharp, brilliant, precise and clear. A pure vein of lofty spiritualism runs through it, and although this is our first introduction to the young author in the literary field, we consider him a writer of uncommon promise and ability. Of the plates in this number of the Rose we cannot say much; to us, however, this is of small consequence. The work itself, is an honor to the denomination, and in every way worthy of public patronage.

*.

2. Essays on Human Rights and their Political Guaranties: by E. P. Hurlbut, Counsellor at Law in the City of New-York. New-York: Greeley & McElrath, 158 Nassau-street. 1845. 12mo. pp. 219.

We are hardly competent to form a safe opinion of such a work as this,—the subject is so far out of our line. It appears to us, however, to suggest some very good things, while as a whole it is crude, and in certain parts rather superficial, especially in basing the science of human rights on phrenology. Its doctrines are generally "*radical*," perhaps to an extreme.

Digitized by Google

Digitized by Google

Digitized by Google

Digitized by Google

Acme
Bookbinding Co., Inc.
300 Summer Street
Boston, Mass. 02210

Digitized by Google

Digitized by Google

Digitized by Google